



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

HISTORY
OF
CHRISTIANITY.

0

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;

INCLUDING THAT OF

THE POPES

TO

THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.


VOLUME VIII.

ORK
IG AND SON
WAY

3750
✓✓

1881. Mar. 23,
Walker Fund.

KD53995(8)
L₂



Transferred from
Lamont

UNIVERSITY PRESS: JOHN WILSON & SON,
CAMBRIDGE.

CONTENTS

OF

THE EIGHTH VOLUME.

BOOK XIII. (*continued.*)

CHAPTER XIII.

COUNCIL OF FERRARA — THE GREEKS.

A.D.		PAGE
	Proposed Reconciliation of Greek Empire and Church.....	14
	Proceedings at Constantinople.....	17
1435	Council suspends the Pope.....	18
	The Emperor John Palæologus.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Fleets of the Pope and the Council.....	22
1437	The voyage.....	24
1438	Arrival at Venice.....	25
	Arrival at Ferrara.....	27
	Plague at Ferrara.....	31
	Journey to Florence.....	33
	France — Pragmatic Sanction — Synod of Bourges	34

CHAPTER XIV.

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

1438-9	Procession of the Holy Ghost.....	41
	Terms of Treaty.....	44
	Close of the Session.....	48
	Return of the Greeks to Constantinople.....	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XV.

CONTINUATION OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE—POPE FELIX.

A.D.		PAGE
	Archbishop of Arles.....	53
1439	Deposition of Pope Eugenius.....	55
	Election of Pope Felix.....	60
1440	Coronation.....	61
	Neutrality of Germany — Diets.....	62

CHAPTER XVI.

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINI — DISSOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE.

	Youth of Æneas.....	65
	Æneas in Scotland.....	67
	His morals.....	71
	Æneas at Basle.....	74
	Secretary to Pope Felix.....	80
	Secretary to the Emperor.....	81
	Æneas in Holy Orders.....	84
1444	Æneas Imperial Ambassador to Rome.....	88
	Æneas Secretary to the Pope.....	<i>ib.</i>
1446	Again at Rome.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Gregory of Heimburg.....	93
	Diet at Frankfort.....	94
1447	Death of Eugenius IV.....	98

CHAPTER XVII.

NICOLAS V.

	Election of Nicolas V.....	100
1449	Dissolution of Council of Basle — Abdication of Pope Felix.....	102
	Æneas in Milan.....	105
	Character of Nicolas V.....	106
1450	Jubilee.....	108
1452	Coronation of the Emperor Frederick III.....	111

A. D.		PAGE
	Conspiracy of Stephen Porcario.....	114
	Taking of Constantinople.....	118
1454	Death of Nicolas V.....	119
	Nicolas patron of letters and arts.....	121
	His buildings.....	126

BOOK XIV.

CHAPTER I.

SURVEY.

Clergy and Laity.....	132
Intellectual education of Clergy.....	134
Spiritual power.....	136
Monks and Friars.....	139
Property of Clergy — Tithe.....	141
Landed wealth.....	144
France — England.....	146
Doomsday.....	147
Valuation of Henry VIII.....	151
Rent in money and kind.....	153
Oblations.....	155
Unity of the Clergy.....	157
Ubiquity of Clergy.....	160
Social effects.....	163
.....	166
rgy ..	167
— Italy.....	170
France.....	173
Spain — Germany.....	175
England.....	177

CHAPTER II.

BELIEF OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE
The Creed.....	185
Popular religion.....	186
Angels.....	189
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.....	190
Demonology.....	196
Satan.....	199
The Virgin.....	203
The Saints.....	204
Relics.....	217
Hell.....	221
Purgatory.....	224
Heaven.....	227

CHAPTER III.

LATIN LETTERS.

Theology.....	234
Earlier Schoolmen.....	236
Peter Lombard.....	238
Mystics.....	240
Arabic Philosophy.....	243
Aristotle.....	245
Translations of Aristotle.....	248
The Schoolmen.....	249
The five great Schoolmen —	
Albert the Great.....	257
Thomas Aquinas.....	265
St. Bonaventura.....	273
Duns Scotus.....	276
(Scotists and Thomists).....	280
William of Ockham.....	282
Roger Bacon.....	288
— The De Imitatione Christi.....	297

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LATIN POETRY—HISTORY.

	PAGE
Latin Poetry—Paraphrases.....	302
Later Latin Poems.....	305
Lives of the Saints.....	307
Hymnology.....	308
Mysteries.....	312
Hroswitha.....	316
Anacreontic Songs.....	319
Satiric Poems.....	324
History.....	331

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN LETTERS IN THE NEW LANGUAGES OF EUROPE.

French—Spanish—German—English.....	335
Provençal Poetry.....	337
Dante.....	338
Petrarch.....	342
Boccaccio.....	ib.

CHAPTER VI.

Language of France.....	350
The Normans.....	353
Poetry of Langue d'Oil—Trouvères.....	356
Memoires.....	359

CHAPTER VII.

THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Provençal.....	360
.....	363
Spanish.....	364
.....	368

CONTENTS OF VOL. VIII.

	PAGE
Piers Ploughman.....	371
Wycliffe's Bible.....	384
Chaucer.....	385
Germany.....	391
Preachers.....	395
John Tauler.....	397
Nicolas of Basle.....	401
Mysticism.....	405
Friends of God.....	407
German Theology.....	408

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

Architecture faithful to the Church.....	409
I. Roman Architecture.....	412
The Arch.....	414
Constantine the Great.....	415
Constantinople.....	417
II. Justinian.....	418
St. Sophia.....	420
Hierarchical influence.....	422
The Church — The builders in the West. <i>ib.</i>	
Motives for church-building.....	427
The Church the people's.....	431
III. Byzantine, Lombard, or Romanesque.....	432
IV. Norman Architecture.....	436
V. Gothic Architecture.....	437
The Gothic the consummation of church architecture.....	446
Symbolism.....	447

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIAN SCULPTURE.

Christian sculpture in the East.....	452
Proscribed in the East.....	455
Sculpture in the West.....	456

	PAGE
Architectural Sculpture.....	457
Monumental Sculpture.....	460

CHAPTER X.

CHRISTIAN PAINTING.

The Catacombs.....	465
Types of the Saviour, &c.....	468
Monks of St. Basil.....	470
Change in the tenth century.....	<i>ib.</i>
Mosaics.....	472
Dawn of Art.....	476
Giotto.....	<i>ib.</i>
Mendicant Orders.....	479
Frà Angelico.....	482
Transalpine painting.....	484
Art under Nicolas V.....	486
Revolution begun under Nicolas V.....	487
I. Progress of human intellect.....	489
II. Revival of Letters.....	490
III. Modern Languages.....	493
IV. Printing and paper.....	494
Conclusion.....	497

INDEX.....	507
------------	-----

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK XIII. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER XIII.

COUNCIL OF FERRARA. THE GREEKS.

THE Pope had appealed to Christendom on his original inherent irresponsible autocracy, even before the affair of the reconciliation of the Greek Church becoming more urgent gave him a special pretext for convoking the Council to some city of Italy. This act was in truth the dissolution of the Council of Basle. For the Teutonic Council of Basle with all its aspirations after freedom, the substitution of an Italian Council, if not servilely submissive, in interests and views closely bound up with the Pope, had been from the first the declared policy of Eugenius IV. And now the union of the Churches of the East and West, so long delayed, so often interrupted, might seem an inevitable necessity; it was imminent, immediate, at the will and the command of the West, which might dictate its own terms. The Emperor, and even the Patriarch of Constantinople seemed driven, in their deathpang of terror at the approach of the victorious

Turks, to accept the aid of the West at any cost, at any sacrifice. The Emperor John Palæologus was hardly master of more than the Imperial city. Constantinople was nearly the whole Byzantine Empire.

Nothing, however, shows more clearly that the Council and the Pope divided the allegiance of Christendom than that ambassadors from the Eastern Empire appeared in Basle as well as in Rome. Negotiations were conducted between the Emperor and Patriarch as well with the Council as with the Pope.¹ Legates from the Council as from the Pope were sent to Constantinople. Contracts were entered into for galleys, if not hired, promised both by Pope and Council to convey the Byzantine and his Clergy to the West. The crafty Greeks seemed disposed to bargain with the highest bidder, and with him who could give best security. The difficulties and advantages seemed singularly balanced. The Pope might admit the Easterns to unity, but Transalpine Christendom alone could pay the price of their laudable apostasy. Effective aid could be expected not from Italy, but from the Emperor (Sigismund was still on the throne) and from a crusade of all Europe. If the Greeks were unwilling to appear at Basle, the Council would consent to adjourn for this purpose to Avignon. And Avignon, it was thought, would purchase the high

¹ Syropulus (p. 17), the Greek, describes the Council as assembled to remedy the monstrous evils which had grown up in the West, and for the limitation of the Pope's power, and that of his court: 'Επὶ διορθώσει τῶν ἀτόπων τῶν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἰταλίας παρεισφθαρέντων, καὶ μαλίστα ἐπὶ τῇ συστολῇ καὶ ὑποτυπώσει τοῦ Πάπα καὶ τῆς κύρτης αὐτοῦ. Of the three ambassadors to Basle, two were Demetrius, the great Stratopedarch, and Isidore, afterwards Metropolitan of Russia. See the account of their reception — Syropulus, p. 23, *et seq.*

honor of becoming the seat of the Council for this glorious object, at the price of 70,000 pieces of gold for the convoy of the Emperor and his retinue. Avignon declined, or at least was not prompt in the acceptance of these terms.

The Pope during the preceding year had offered the choice of the great cities of Italy — Bologna, Ancona, Ravenna, Florence, Pisa, Mantua, even Rome. He now insisted on the alternative of Florence or of Udine in the Friulian province of his native Venice. Florence, his faithful ally, would open her own gates, Venice would admit a Council into her territory, not within her lagunes. If the reconciliation of the Greek and the Latin Church, the tardy and compulsory submission of Constantinople to the See of Rome, had been the one paramount, transcendent duty of Christendom ; if it was to swallow up and supersede all the long agitated questions of the reform in the hierarchy, the reinstatement of the sacerdotal Order not only in its power but in its commanding holiness, the Pope might urge strong reasons for the transplantation of the Council to Italy. The Greeks might well be alarmed at the unnecessary difficulties of a journey over the snowy Alps, the perils of wild roads, of robber chieftains. The Pope felt his strength in resting the dispute on that issue alone. At all events it might create a schism at Basle. The Transalpine party still adhered to Avignon, or some city of France. But if the Greeks also were to be considered, there could be no doubt of the superior convenience of Italy.¹

¹ On one occasion the Patriarch said with simplicity that he had no inclination to be food for fishes: Ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ ἄξιον κρίνετε φείδεσθαι ἔμμαντοῦ, μήποτε καὶ ἐν τῷ πελάγει ριφεῖς κατάβρωμα γένωμαι τῶν ἰχθύων. —

The Papal Legate, the Archbishop of Tarento, appeared at Basle to propose the removal of the Council for this great end to Florence or to Udine. The President of the Council was still the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. Up to this time Cæsarini had stood firm and unshaken on the rights of the Council, but now with other Italian Prelates inclined towards obedience to the Pope. But the large number of the Transalpine Clergy, especially of the lower clergy, knew that once evoked to Italy the Council, as an independent assembly, was at an end. The debate was long and turbulent. They came to the vote. Above two thirds of the Council rejected the prorogation to Florence or Udine. The Duke of Milan, still opposed to the Pope in Italian politics, on his part desirous of having the Council in his dominions, offered a third alternative, the city of Pavia. Æneas Sylvius, in an eloquent speech of two hours (it was a convenient resting-place for Æneas ere he passed from the interests of the Council to that of the Pope), urged this middle course. He wrought on the ambassadors of Castile, but the Council was obdurate; it would not pass the Alps. The decree of the majority was publicly read, ordered to be engrossed, and confirmed with the seal of the Council. To the indignation of most, a Bishop arose and published aloud the decree of the minority as that of the Council.¹ Nor was this all; at night the Bull of the Council was stolen from its box, the silken thread which attached the seal had been cut, the seal appended to the substituted decree

Syropulus, p. 22. The magniloquent Latin translator makes the fishes whales.

¹ Æneas Sylvius, p. 73. L'Enfant, i. p. 481, &c.

of the Papal party. The fraud was openly charged, it was believed to be brought home to the Legate, the Archbishop of Tarento. His officer was treated with contumely, even with personal violence. The Archbishop with inconceivable effrontery, avowed and gloried in the crime. He had advised, ordered, aided in the theft. He had done it, and would do it were it to do again. Must he not obey the Apostolic See rather than a rabble?¹ He fled from the city (he was threatened with imprisonment) under an armed July 5, 1437. escort. The Emperor heard of this unworthy artifice; he declared that the crime should not pass unpunished. Europe rang with the guilt of the Legate.

Eugenius loudly protested against this insolent impeachment of his Legate. He denounced the violence threatened against his sacred person, the rude usage of the Archbishop's officer: he afterwards rewarded the Archbishop with the Cardinalate. His protest and denunciations were heard with incredulity or indifference at Basle.

The Pope was more successful in his dealings at Constantinople. The Assembly, he urged, was but a small knot of unruly spirits, usurping the name of a Council; their sole object was to diminish the power of the Pope, the Pope who alone had the right to summon a Council and control their proceedings. He warned the Byzantines against trusting to their promises; they had no money to transport the Greeks to

¹ "Tarentinus alti cordis vir, intrepidus, audax. Quid vos, inquit, tantopere factum vituperatis? Rectum est et laude dignum, quod reprehenditur. Suasi ego rem, fieri mandavi, operam dedi, et nisi fecissem, hodie facerem. Apostolicæ Sedi magis quam vestræ turbæ obnoxius sum. Verum ego decretum plumbavi, vos adulterinum. Vi nos impediistis plumbare: cur arte non vindicabimus, quod nobis vi rapitur? nolo negare quod feci et recte feci." — *Æn. Sylvius*, p. 74.

the West, none for ulterior purposes. Venice had already prepared her galleys for the convoy of the Emperor. Of Venice the Greeks well knew the power and the wealth. Yet the crafty Greeks might well smile at the zeal of the Pope for the unity of the Church, which made him hold up their reconciliation as the one great object of Christendom, while in the West the unity was thus broken by the feud of Pope and Council.

That feud was growing more violent and irreconcilable. The Council issued their monition to the Pope and to the Cardinals to appear before them at Basle within sixty days, and answer for their acts. They annulled his creation of Cardinals. At the expiration of the sixty days they solemnly declared the Pope contumacious. He had promulgated his Bull for the Council of Ferrara. That Bull they declared void and of none effect. After some delay they proceeded to the suspension of the Pope. Other resolutions passed, limiting appeals to the Roman See, abolishing expectatives, gradually unfolding and expanding their views of Church Reformation.

The union of the Greek and Latin Churches, as it was understood in the West by the Pope and the high Papalists, the unqualified subjection of the East to the successor of St. Peter, by the Council the subjection to the Western Church represented at Basle, seemed to acquire more paramount importance from the eager and emulous exertions of the Council and the Pope to secure each to itself the Imperial proselyte. The Emperor, John VI. Palæologus, might at first appear to balance with lofty indifference their

The Emperor
John Palæo-
logus.

conflicting claims ; to weigh the amount and the certainty of their offers, in which they vied against each other ; and to debate which would be the most serviceable ally against the terrible Ottoman, and therefore best reward the sacrifice of the religious freedom of the East. Those were not wanting who advised him to dismiss the ambassadors of both, and declare, “ when you have settled your own quarrels¹ it will be time for us to discuss the terms of union.” Friar John, the Legate of the Council, as he began to despair of conducting the Emperor to Basle, would at all hazards keep him away from Italy. He urged this dignified course ; the more important adviser, the Emperor Sigismund, gave the same counsel.² But the Byzantine was now resolutely, as far as a mind so feeble was capable of resolution, determined on his journey to the West. He could not hope to hold a Council in Constantinople, in which the West would be but partially represented, if it condescended to be represented ; or in which his own Church, dominant in numbers, if required to make the slightest concession, would render obedience. His fears and his vanity had wrought him to desperate courage. He could not but know that the Turks were still closing round his narrowing empire, though there was for the moment some delay or suspense in their movements. Amurath had hardly consented to a hollow and treacherous delay,³ and who could know when they might be under the walls of Constantinople ? Yet had Palæologus strange notions

¹ Laonicus Chalcondylas. By a great anachronism he antedates the election of the Antipope Felix by the Council at Basle, and makes it a contest between the rival Pontiffs. — lvi. p. 287. Edit. Bonn.

² Syropulus, p. 57.

³ The treaty in Phranza, p. 118.

of his own grandeur. The West would lay itself at his feet; he might be chosen the successor of Sigismund, and reunite the great Christian commonwealth under one sovereign.¹

But he had great difficulty in persuading the heads of his Church to embark on a perilous voyage to a distant and foreign Council, where their few voices might be overborne by multitudes. Joseph the Patriarch was old, infirm, of feeble character: he yielded with ungracious reluctance,² but scrupled not to compel the attendance of his more prudent and far-sighted clergy. They too found consolation to their vanity, food for their ambition. "The barbarous and ignorant West would bow before the learning and profound theology of the successors of Basil, the Gregories, and Chrysostom." Nor were they without some vague notions of the prodigal and overflowing wealth of the West: they would return having achieved a victory by their irresistible arguments, and at the same time with money enough to pay their debts.³ If the Latins should stand aloof in sullen obstinacy, they would return with the pride of having irradiated Italy with the truth, and of having maintained in the face of Rome the cause of orthodoxy; at the worst, they could but die as glorious martyrs for that truth.⁴ The Patriarch labored under still more extravagant illusions. "When the Eastern

¹ Syropulus, p. 36.

² See his speech (Syropulus, p. 16) in the time of Pope Martin, in which he predicts the inevitable humiliation from attending a Council in Italy, at the expense of the Westerns. Ἐν γοῦν τῷ ἀπελθεῖν οὕτω καὶ ἐκδέχεσθαι καὶ τὴν ἡμερεσίαν τροφὴν ἐξ ἐκείνων, ἤδη γίνονται δούλοι καὶ μισθωταί, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ κύριοι.

³ Syropulus, p. 63, 3. Καὶ ἀπελευσόμεθα καὶ ὑποστρέψομεν νικηταὶ τροπαιοῦχοι.

⁴ Syropulus, *ibid.*

Emperor should behold the pomp of the Pope, the lowly deference paid to their ecclesiastical superiors by the great potentates of the West, he would take lessons of humility, and no longer mistake the relative dignity of the spiritual and temporal Sovereign.”¹ These strange and chimerical hopes blinded some at least to the danger of their acts, and even mitigated for a time their inextinguishable hatred of the Latins ; for the Latin conquest of Constantinople still left its deep indelible animosity in the hearts of the Greek Churchmen. They had been thrust from their Sees ; Latin Bishops speaking a foreign tongue had been forced upon their flocks ; they had been stripped of their revenues, reduced to poverty and contempt. On the reconquest of Constantinople, the Cantacuzenes and Palæologi had resumed the full temporal sovereignty, but the Church had recovered only a portion of its influence, wealth, and power. Even in Constantinople, still more in many cities of the Empire, the Latin Bishops still claimed a coördinate authority, refused to be deposed, and, where the Franks were in force, maintained their thrones. There were at least titular Latin Bishops of most of the great Eastern Sees.

The Emperor and the Patriarch determined to accept the invitation of the Pope, and to reject that of the Council. Vague and terrible notions of the danger of surmounting the Alps, or of the interminable voyage to Marseilles, if Avignon should be the seat of the Council ; the more doubtful, less profuse promises of money for the voyage from the Council ; the greater dexterity and address of the

Emperor
accepts the
offer of
Rome.

¹ Syropoulos, p. 92. Καὶ διὰ τοῦ πάπα ἐθάρρει ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιτιθείσης αὐτοῦ δουλείας παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. — κ. τ. λ.

Papal Legate, wrought powerfully on their minds. The fatal and insulting declaration of the Council — “They had subdued the new heresy of the Bohemians, they should easily subdue the old heresy of the Greeks”¹ — had been industriously reported, and could not be forgiven. More politic Rome made no such mistake: her haughtiness could wait its time, could reserve itself in bland courteousness till the adversary was in her power, at her feet.

Eight Papal galleys, furnished in Venice and in Rival fleets. Crete, entered the harbor of Constantinople. They had not long arrived when it was heard that the fleet of the Council was drawing near. The Council had at length prevailed on the city of Avignon to furnish the necessary funds; the ships had been hired and manned at Marseilles. The Roman Admiral, the Pope’s nephew Condolmieri, produced his commission to burn, sink, or destroy the hostile fleet. He gave orders to his squadron to set sail and encounter the insolent enemy.² It was with great difficulty that the Emperor prevented a battle between the fleets of the Pope and of the Council: an edifying proof to the Turks, who occupied part of the shores, of the unity of Christendom! — to the Greeks a significant but disregarded warning, as to the advantages which they might expect from their concessions to Western Christendom, itself in such a state of fatal disunion!

After nearly three months’ delay — delay afterwards bitterly reproached by the Pope against the Greeks, as

¹ Syropulus, p. 27.

² Μόλις οὖν διὰ πολλῶν λόγων καὶ μηνυμάτων κατέπεισε τὸν καντλουμέρη, καὶ ἡσύχασε. — Syropulus, p. 55. The Papal Legates had persuaded the Greeks that the Council of Basle was dissolved.

having involved much loss of time and needless expense — the Emperor and the Patriarch embarked on board the Venetian galleys. The Emperor was accompanied by his brother, the Despot Demetrius, whom it might be dangerous to leave behind at Constantinople; and attended by a Court, the magnificence of whose titles might make up for their moderate numbers. The Church made even a more imposing display. The Patriarch was encircled by the Bishops of the most famous Sees in the East, some of them men of real distinction. There were those who either held or were supposed to be the representatives of the three Patriarchates now under Moslem dominion — Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem; the Primate of Russia, whose wealth excited the wonder and envy of the Greeks; Bessarion Archbishop of Nicea, and Mark of Ephesus, the two most renowned for their learning; the Prelates of Cyzicum, Heraclea, Nicomedia, Trebizond, Lacedæmon, and other famous names. The greater monasteries were represented by some of their Archimandrites. The Patriarch was attended, in his person, by all the high officers and the inferior dignitaries of St. Sophia, the cross-bearers, the whole choir of singers, the treasurer, the guardian of the books, the guardian of the vestments, the guardian of those who claimed the right of asylum, the expounder of the Canon Law, and Syropulus, the Ecclesiast or the Preacher. The last avenged the compulsion laid upon him to follow his master to Ferrara and Florence by writing a lively and bold history of the whole proceedings.¹ The

¹ This remarkable work of Syropulus is the chief and trustworthy authority for the voyage, personal adventures, and personal feelings of the Greeks.

preparations, both of the Emperor and the Patriarch, made an incongruous display of pomp and poverty. The Emperor, that he might appear as the magnificent Sovereign of the East, to the indignation of the Church appropriated and lavished the sacred treasures, which had been sent as votive offerings by rich worshippers, on his own adornments, on a golden chariot, and cloth of gold for his bed. It was proposed that the Patriarch alone should appear in becoming state; the Bishops without their useless copes and dalmatics, in the coarse dress and cowls of simple monks. It was answered that the haughty Latins would scoff at their indigence. Notwithstanding the prodigies which remonstrated against their removal, the sacred vessels of St. Sophia were borne off, that the Patriarch might everywhere be able to celebrate Mass in unpolluted patens and chalices, and without being exposed to the contemptuous toleration of the Latins. When, however, on the division of the first Papal subsidy (15,000 florins), the Emperor assigned only the sum of 6000 to the clergy, the Patriarch resolutely declared that he would not proceed to the Council. The Emperor was no less stubborn: he gave the Patriarch 1000 for his own use, and distributed the 5000 among the clergy; to the richer less, to the poor more.¹

An earthquake (dire omen!) shook the city as they ~~The voyage.~~ set sail. The voyage was long, seventy-seven days. The timid landsman, the Ecclesiast, may have exaggerated its discomforts and perils. It was humiliating alike to the Emperor and to the Patriarch. As they passed Gallipoli they were saluted with showers of javelins from the Turkish forts. In another place,

¹ Syropulus, 63.

though there was no declared war, the Hagarenes would scarcely allow them to take in water. The Emperor hardly escaped falling into the hands of some Catalan pirates. The Patriarch, when he landed, had to endure the parsimonious courtesy and the niggard hospitality of the Latin Prelates who occupied Greek Sees on the coast.¹

Nothing, however, could equal the magnificence of their reception at Venice. The pride of the Republic was roused to honor, no doubt to ^{Arrival at Venice.} dazzle, so distinguished a guest. As they approached the Lagunes, the Doge rowed forth in the Bucen-taur, with twelve other galleys, the mariners in silken dresses, the awnings and flags of silk, the emblazoned banners of St. Mark waving gorgeously above. The sea was absolutely covered with gondolas and galleys. "You might as well number the leaves of the trees, the sands of the sea, or the drops of rain." The amazement of the Greeks at the splendor, wealth, and populousness of Venice forcibly shows how Constantinople had fallen from her Imperial state: — "Venice the wonderful — most wonderful! Venice the wise — most wise! The city foreshown in the Psalm, 'God has founded her upon the waters.'"²

The respectful homage of the Doge to the Emperor was construed by the Greeks into adoration.³ He was conducted (all the bells of the city loudly pealing, and music everywhere sounding) up to the Rialto.

¹ See the voyage in Syropulus at length, with many amusing incidents by land and sea, 69, *et seq.* Gibbon justly says that "the historian has the uncommon talent of placing each scene before the reader's eye." — Note c xvi. p. 99.

² Phranza, ii. 15, p. 181, 6. Edit. Bonn.

³ Phranza says, προσεκύνησε τὸν βασιλέα καθήμενον.

There he was lodged in a noble and spacious palace : the Patriarch in the monastery of St. George. The Patriarch visited the church of St. Mark. The Greeks gazed in utter astonishment at the walls and ceilings glittering with mosaics of gold and precious stones, and the carvings in precious woods. The great treasury, shown only twice a year, flew open before them : they beheld the vast and incalculable mass of gold and jewels, wrought with consummate art, and set in the most exquisite forms ; but amid their amazement rose the bitter thought, " These were once our own : they are the plunder of our Santa Sophia, and of our holy monasteries." ¹

The Doge gave counsel to the Emperor — wise Venetian counsel, but not quite in accordance with the close alliance of Venice with the Pope, or her respect for her mitred son, Eugenius IV.² He might take up his abode in Venice, duly balance the offers of the Pope and the Council of Basle, and accept the terms most advantageous to himself or his Empire.

If the Emperor hesitated, he was determined by the arrival of Cardinal Cæsarini, deputed by the Pope, with the Marquis of Este, to press his immediate presence at Ferrara. Julian Cæsarini had now abandoned the Council of Basle : his desertion to the

¹ Syropulus. There was one splendid image wrought entirely out of the gold and jewels taken in Constantinople: *Τοῖς μὲν κεκτημένοις καύχημα καὶ τέρψις ἐγένετο καὶ ἡδονή, τοῖς δ' ἀφαιρεθείσιν εἰ ποῦ καὶ παρατύχοιεν, ἀθύρμα καὶ λύπη καὶ κατήφεια, ὥς καὶ ἡμῖν τότε συνέβη.* Syropulus is better authority than Ducas, and would hardly have suppressed, if he had witnessed the wonder of the Venetians at the celebration of the Mass by the Greeks according to their own rite. "' Verily,'" writes Ducas, " they exclaimed in wonder, ' these are the first-born of the Church, and the Holy Ghost speaks in them.' " — Ducas, c. xxxi.

² Syropulus, p. 85.

hostile camp might indicate that their cause was sinking towards desperation. He was now the Legate of the Pope, not that of the majority, it might be, but dwindling, more democratic, almost discomfited, majority at Basle.¹

Early in March the Emperor set forward to Ferrara. He travelled (it was so arranged) partly by water, partly by land, with greater speed than the aged Patriarch, who was highly indignant, as the Church ought to have taken precedence. In the reception of the Emperor at Ferrara all was smooth courtesy. He rode a magnificent black charger; The Emperor at Ferrara. another of pure white, with trappings emblazoned with golden eagles, was led before him. The Princes of Este bore the canopy over his head. He rode into the courts of the Papal palace, dismounted at the staircase, was welcomed at the door of the chamber by the Pope. He was not permitted to kneel, but saluted with a holy kiss, and took his seat at the Pope's right hand. The attendants had indeed lifted up the hem of the Pope's garment, and exposed his foot, but of this the Greeks took no notice. The Patriarch moved more slowly: his barge was splendidly adorned,² but there ended his idle honors. He had still March 4.

¹ There is however considerable difficulty, and there are conflicting authorities as to the time, at which Julian Cæsarini, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, left Basle (see Fea's note to *Æneas Sylvius*, p. 128): and also whether, as Sanuto asserts, he appeared before the Emperor of the East, not as representative of the Pope, but of the Council. Cæsarini seems to have been in a state of embarrassment: he attempted to mediate between the more violent and the papalizing parties at Basle. He lingered for some months in this doubtful state. Though accredited by the Pope at Venice, he may have given himself out as representing the sounder, though smaller part of the Council of Basle. This was evidently the tone of the Eugenians.

² Phranza compares it to Noah's Ark. He was astonished with its sumptuousness and accommodation. — P. 189.

cherished the fond hope that the Pope would receive him as his equal. He had often boasted that the Patriarchate would now be delivered from its base subjection to the Empire. He was met by a messenger with the tidings that the Pope expected him to kneel in adoration and kiss his foot. This degrading ceremony his own Bishops had declined.¹ “If he is the successor of St. Peter,” said the Patriarch in his bitterness, “so are we of the other Apostles. Did they kiss St. Peter’s feet?” No Cardinals came out to meet him, only six Bishops, at the bridge. His own Bishops, who were with him, reproached the Patriarch: “Are these the honors with which you assured us we were to be received?” The Patriarch threatened to return home. The Pope, disappointed in the public humiliation of the Patriarch at his feet, would grant only a private audience. In the morning they all mounted horses furnished by the Marquis of Este, and rode to the gates of the Papal palace. All but the Patriarch alighted. He rode through the courts to the foot of the staircase. They passed through a suit of chambers, through an array of attendants with silver wands of office. The doors closed behind them. They were admitted only six at a time to the presence of the Pope. Eugenius was seated with only his Cardinals around. He welcomed the Patriarch with a brotherly salute. The Patriarch took his seat somewhat lower, on a level with the Cardinals. His cross-bearers did not accompany him: they came last, and were permitted to kiss the hand and the cheek of the Pope. Now as afterwards, in their more private intercourse, the Pope and the Patriarch being

¹ Syropulus, p. 95.

ignorant, the one of Greek, the other of Latin, discoursed through an interpreter.¹

The Greeks had not been many days at Ferrara, ere they began to suspect that the great object of the Pope was his own aggrandizement, ^{Discontent of the} ~~Discontent~~ ^{Greeks.} the strengthening of his power against the Council of Basle. They looked with jealousy on every artful attempt to degrade their Patriarch from his absolute coequality with the Pope, on his lower seat, and the limitation of the honors paid to him ; they reproached the Patriarch with every seeming concession to the Papal pride.² Before they met in the Council, they had the prudence curiously to inspect the arrangements in the great church. They found a lofty and sumptuous throne raised for the Pope in the midst : the rest were to sit, as it were, at his feet. Even the Emperor was roused to indignation. After much dispute it was agreed that the Pope should occupy a central throne, but slightly elevated. On his right, was a vacant chair for the Emperor of the West, then the Cardinals and dignitaries of the Latin Church ; on his left, the seat of the Eastern Emperor, followed by the Patriarch and the Greek clergy. But the affairs dragged languidly on. The Pope affected to expect submission of the Fathers of Basle. The Italian Prelates were by no means imposing in numbers ; of the other Latin clergy were very few. The only ambassadors, those of the Duke of Burgundy. The Greeks perhaps knew not in what terms the Western clergy had been summoned. “ If the Latins had any parental

¹ Syropulus, p. 96.

² The Bishop of Trebisonde was usually the spokesman. Syropulus, p. 100.

love they would hasten to welcome the prodigal son : the Greek Church returning to his father's home." The appeal to the charity of the Latins had no great result. The Patriarch had joined with the Pope at the first Session in an anathema, if they should contumaciously remain aloof from this Council. Awe was as powerless as love.

The Emperor retired to a monastery about six miles from Ferrara, and abandoned himself to the pleasures of the chase. The husbandmen in vain remonstrated against his wanton destruction of their crops, the Marquis of Ferrara¹ against his slaughter of the pheasants and quails which he had preserved at great cost.² The Patriarch and the clergy were left to suffer every kind of humiliating indignity, and worse than indignity. They were constantly exposed to endure actual hunger ; their allowance in wine, fish, meat was scanty and irregular ; their stipends in money always many months in arrear. They were close prisoners ;³ rigid police watched at the gates of the city : no one could stir without a passport.⁴ The Bishop of Ferrara refused them one of the great churches to celebrate Mass according to their own rite : he would not have his holy edifice polluted. Three of them made their escape to Venice, and were ignominiously brought back. A second time they contrived to fly, and found their way

¹ Nicolas III. of Este. Laonicus Chalcondylas takes the opportunity of telling of the Marquis the dreadful story which is the groundwork of Lord Byron's "Parisina." — 288, &c.

² Raynald. sub ann.

³ This ancient Italian usage, that no one could leave a city without a passport from the authorities, astonished the Greeks. — Syropulus, p. 141.

⁴ Syropulus, *ibid.* He is indignant: Οὕτως ὁ Πνευματικός ἀνὴρ τμητὴν ἔγνω τοῦς τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ὑπηρέτας.

to Constantinople. The indignant Patriarch sent home orders that the recreants should be suspended from their office, and soundly flogged.¹ Tidings in the mean time arrived, fortunately exaggerated, that the Ottoman who had condescended to grant a precarious peace, threatened Constantinople; the Pope evaded the demand for succor. He, indeed, himself was hardly safe. The bands of Nicolas Piccinino, Captain of a terrible Free Company, had seized Forlì and Bologna.

The miserable Greek clergy urged the Patriarch, the slow and irresolute Patriarch at length urged the Emperor, too well amused with his hunting, to insist on the regular opening of the Council. "We must wait the arrival of the ambassadors from the Sovereigns and Princes, of more Cardinals and Bishops; the few at present in Ferrara cannot presume to form an Œcumenic Council." Autumn drew on; with autumn the plague began to appear. Of the eleven Cardinals only five, of the one hundred and sixty Bishops only fifty remained in Ferrara. The Greeks escaped the ravage of the pestilence, all but the Russians: they suffered a fearful decimation.²

Not, indeed, that the whole of this time had been wasted in inactivity. Conferences had been held: private Synods, not recognized as formal acts of the Council, had defined the four great points of difference between the Greek and Latin Churches. Scandalous rumors indeed were disseminated that the Greeks were guilty of fifty-four articles of heresy; these charges were disdained as of no authority; but the Greeks were not less affected, and not less despised and hated by the mass of the people for such disclaimer. The

¹ Syropulus, p. 125.

² Id. p. 144.

Council was at length formally opened ; but throughout it was skilfully contrived that while there was the most irreverent confusion among the Greeks, the Patriarch was treated with studied neglect, the Emperor himself, with reluctant and parsimonious honors ; the Pope maintained his serene dignity ; all the homage paid to him was skilfully displayed. The Greeks were jealous of each other ; the courtly and already wavering Prelate of Nicea was in constant collision with the ruder but more faithful Mark of Ephesus ; they could not but feel and betray, they knew not how to resent, their humiliation.¹ Their dismay and disgust was consummated by news of the intended adjournment of the Council to Florence. They would not at first believe it ; the Emperor was obliged to elude their remonstrances by ambiguous answers. The terrors of the plague, which Syropulus avers had passed away for two months ; the promises of better supplies, and more regular payments in rich and fertile Tuscany ; the neighborhood of commodious havens, where they might embark for Greece ; above all, starvation, not only feared, but almost actually suffered : all were as nothing against the perils of a journey over the wild and unknown Apennines, perhaps beset by the marauding troops of Piccinino, the greater distance from Venice, and, therefore, from their home. Already the Bishop of Heraclea, the homophylax, and even Mark of Ephesus, had attempted flight, and had been brought back by actual force or by force disguised as persuasion.²

The clergy with undissembled reluctance,³ or rather

¹ See all the latter part of the 6th section of Syropulus.

² Syropulus, 151.

³ Καὶ πάντες τὸ τῆς μεταβίσεως δεινὸν ὁμονῶς ἐκτραγώδοντες καὶ

under strong compulsion, the Emperor with ungracious compliance, yielded at length to the unavoidable necessity. The Emperor and the Pa-^{Journey to Florence.} triarch, the Pope and his Cardinals found their long way to Florence, not indeed by the ordinary roads, for the enemy occupied Bologna, but, according to the Greeks, with the haste and secrecy of flight; to the Latins, with the dignity of voluntary retirement. The Pope travelled by Modena; the Emperor and the Patriarch by Faenza, and thence in three days over the savage Apennines to Florence.¹

In Basle, meantime, the Nations continued their sessions, utterly despising the idle menaces ^{Basle.} of the Pope, and the now concurrent anathemas of the Greeks. The Cardinal Louis Archbishop of Arles, a man of all-respected piety and learning, had taken the place as President, on the secession of Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. But not only Cæsarini, the Cardinal of St. Peter's and many others had fallen off from the Council; the King of Arragon, the Duke of Milan menaced away their Prelates. None, it was said, remained, but those without benefices, or those from the kingdoms of which the Sovereigns cared nothing for these religious disputes. Amadeus of Savoy compelled his Bishops to join the Council, to make up a sufficient number to depose the Pope.² The death of the Emperor Sigismund, whose presence in the Dec. 9, 1437. Council had no doubt raised its credit in the minds

ἀποσείσμενοι, καὶ πρὸς ἐμποδισμὸν ταύτης πάντα ὅσα ἐνῆν λέγοντες. — Syropulus, p. 184.

¹ There is now a noble road from Forlì to Florence; but before this road was made it must have been a wild and terrific journey, especially to the sedentary Greek of Constantinople.

² *Æneas Sylvius*, p. 76.

of men, was a fatal blow to the cause of Reformation. His son-in-law, Albert, was chosen at Frankfort King of the Romans; but Albert's disposition on this momentous subject was undeclared; his power not yet confirmed. The German Diet now took a lofty tone of neutrality; they would not interfere in the quarrel (it had sunk into a quarrel) between the Pope and the Council. In vain the Archbishop of Palermo, in the name of the Council, urged that it was the cause of ecclesiastical freedom, of holy religion. Even the great German Prelates heard in apathy.¹

Not so the kingdom of France. On the 1st of May the Gallican Hierarchy, at the summons of the King, assembled in a national Synod at Bourges. The Kings and the clergy of France had seldom let pass an opportunity of declaring their own distinctive and almost exclusive independence on the Papal power. At the same time that they boasted their titles, as inherited from Pepin or Charlemagne as the defenders, protectors, conservators of the Holy See, it was with reservation of their own peculiar rights. They would leave the rest of the world prostrate at the Pope's feet, they would even assist the Pope in compelling their prostration; in France alone they would set limits to, and exercise control over that power. Even St. Louis, the author of the first Pragmatic Sanction, in all other respects the meekest Cath-

At Frank-
fort.
A. D. 1438

France.
Pragmatic
Sanction.

¹ These verses are of the time: —

“ Ut primum magni coepit discordia cleri
Dicunt Germani, nos sine parte sumus.
Hoc ubi non rectum docti docuere magistri
Suspendunt animos, guttura non sapiunt.”

olic Christian, was still King of France. The King, or rather the King's advisers, the Legists and the Counsellors in the Parliament, saw that it was an inestimable occasion for the extension or confirmation of the royal prerogative. The clergy, though they had attended in no great numbers, were still in general adherents of the Council of Basle. The doctrines of Gerson and of the University of Paris were their guides. At the great Synod of Bourges Synod at Bourges. A.D. 1438. the King proposed, the clergy eagerly adopted the decrees of the Council. Yet though they fully admitted the Assembly of Basle to be a legitimate Œcumenic Council, to which all Christians, the Pope himself, owed submission, they virtually placed themselves above Pope or Council. They did not submit to the Council as Legislator of Christendom; their own consent and reënactment was necessary to make the decree of Pope or Council the law of the realm of France. The new Pragmatic Sanction, as now issued, admitted certain of the decrees in all their fulness, from the first word to the last; others they totally rejected, some they modified, or partially received. The Synod of Bourges assumed to be a coördinate, or, as regarded France, a superior Legislature. It asserted the rights of national churches with plenary authority, a doctrine fatal to the universal monarchy of Rome, but not less so to the unity of the Church, as represented by the Pope, or by a General Council. The Pragmatic Sanction encountered no opposition. It enacted these provisions: the Pope was subject to a General Council, and such General Council the Pope was bound to hold every ten years. The Pope had no power to nominate to the great ecclesiastical benefices, except to a few

especially reserved; the right of election devolved on those to whom it belonged. The Court of Rome had no right to the collation to inferior benefices; expectatives or grants of benefices not vacant were absolutely abolished. Appeals of all kinds to Rome were limited to very grave cases. No one was to be disturbed in his possession who had held a benefice for three years. It restricted the number of Cardinals to twenty-four, none to be named under thirty years of age. Annates and first-fruits were declared simoniacal. Priests who retained concubines forfeited their emoluments for three months. There were some regulations for the performance of divine service. The Mass was to be chanted in an audible voice: no layman was to sing psalms or hymns in the vulgar tongue in churches. Spectacles of all sorts, plays, mummeries, masks, banquets in churches were prohibited. The avoiding all commerce with the excommunicated was limited to cases of great notoriety. The interdict was no longer to confound in one sweeping condemnation the innocent and the guilty.¹

Thus, then, while Germany receded into a kind of haughty indifference, France, as far as France, had done the work of the Council. The Pragmatic Sanction was her reform; the dissolution of the Council by the Pope, the deposition of the Pope by the Council, she did not condescend to notice. England, now on the verge of her great civil strife, had never taken much part in the Council, she had not even resented her non-admission as a Nation. Even Spain and Milan

¹ Concilium Bituricense, apud Labbe. Ordonnances de France, xiii. p. 267, 291. L'Enfant, Hist. du Concile de Bâle. Compare Sismondi, Hist. des Français, xii. p. 327.

had to a certain extent withdrawn their sanction. But still the Council of Basle maintained its lofty tone ; it must have had deep root in the reverence of mankind, or it must have fallen away in silent, certain dissolution.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

FLORENCE received the strangers from the East with splendid hospitality. The Emperor, after some contest, allowed the Church on this occasion her coveted precedence.¹ The Patriarch arrived first; he was met by two Cardinals and many Bishops. But at Florence curiosity was not highly excited by the arrival of an aged Churchman: he passed on almost unregarded. Three days after came the Emperor; the city was in a tumult of eager wonder; the roofs were crowded with spectators; trumpets and instruments of music rang through the streets; all the bells pealed; but the magnificence of the pomp (so relates the Ecclesiast, not without some ill-suppressed satisfaction) was marred by deluges of rain.² The gorgeous canopy held over the Emperor's head was drenched; he and all the spectators were glad to find refuge in their houses.

The Council of Florence began with due solemnity its grave theological discussions, on the event of which might seem to depend the active interference of the

¹ Laonicus Chalcondylas describes Florence as the greatest and richest city after Venice. Ἡ δὲ Φλωρεντία πόλις ἐστὶν ὀλβιωτάτα μετὰ γε τὴν Οὐνετιῶν πόλιν, καὶ ἐπὶ ἐμπορίαν ἵμα καὶ γεωργοὺς παρεχομένη τοὺς ἄστοις. This union of agriculture with trade is, I presume, to distinguish them from the Venetians. He enters into the constitution of Florence.

² Syropulus, p. 213.

West to rescue her submissive and orthodox brethren from the Mohammedan yoke, or the abandonment of the rebellious and heretical race to the irresistible Ottoman. It began with solemn order and regularity. The champions were chosen on each side; on the Latin, the most distinguished were the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, the late President of the Council of Basle, not less eminent for learning than for political wisdom; and John, the Provincial General of the Dominican Order in Lombardy, esteemed among the most expert dialecticians of the West. On the side of the Greeks were Isidore of Russia, the courtly Bessarion, who might seem by his temper and moderation (though not unusual accompaniments of real learning) not to have been without some prophetic foresight of the Cardinalate, and the quiet ease of a Western Bishopric; and Mark of Ephesus, whose more obstinate fidelity aspired to be the Defender, the Saint, the Martyr of his own unyielding Church. If legend were to be believed (and legend is still alive in the full light of history) the Greeks were indeed incorrigible. Miracle was wasted upon them. St. Bernardino of Sienna is said to have displayed the first recorded instance of the gift of tongues since the Day of Pentecost; he disputed fluently in Greek, of which he could not before speak or understand one word.¹

Already at Ferrara the four great questions had been proposed which alone were of vital difference to the Greek and Latin Churches. I. The Procession of the Holy Ghost, whether from the Father alone, or likewise from the Son. II. The use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. III. Purgatory.

¹ Raynaldus sub anno.

IV. The Supremacy of the Pope. At Ferrara the more modest discussion had chiefly confined itself to the less momentous questions, those on which the passions were less roused, and which admitted more calm and amicable inquiry, especially that of Purgatory. At Florence they plunged at once into the great absorbing difficulty, the Procession of the Holy Ghost. This, though not absolutely avoided at Ferrara, had been debated only, as it were, in its first approaches. Yet, even on this point,¹ where the object with the Latins, and with the more enlightened and best courtiers of the Greeks, was union not separation, agreement not stubborn antagonism, it began slowly to dawn upon their minds that the oppugnancy was in terms rather than in doctrine; the discrepancy, as it was calmly examined, seemed to vanish of itself. The article, however, involved two questions, one of the profoundest theology, the other of canonical law. I. Which was the orthodox doctrine, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son? II. Even if the latter doctrine were sound, by what right had the Latin Church of her sole authority, in defiance of the anathema of one or more of the four great Œcumenic Councils, presumed to add the words "and the Son" to the creed of Nicea? Which of these questions should take precedence was debated with obstinacy, not without acrimony. The more rigid Greeks would stand upon the plain fact, which could hardly be gainsaid, the unauthorized intrusion of

¹ The Greeks were manifestly bewildered by the scholastic mode of argument, the endless logical formularies of the Latins (Syropulus, *passim*). They were utterly unacquainted with the Latin Fathers; could not distinguish the genuine from spurious citations; or even understand their language. — Syropulus, p. 218.

the clause into the Creed. To the Latins, the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone (the Greek doctrine) was an impious disparagement of the coequal, coeternal Godhead of the Son; to the Greeks the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son also, was the introduction of two principles — it ascribed the incommunicable paternity of the Father to the Son.¹ It was discovered at length that neither did the Latins intend to deny the Father to be the primary and sole fountain of Godhead, nor the Greeks absolutely the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. They all acquiesced in the form “of the Father through the Son;” yet in the different sense of the two Greek prepositions, “from and through,” Mark of Ephesus and the rigid Greeks fought with a stubborn pertinacity as if their own salvation and the salvation of mankind were on the issue.² But the real difficulty was the addition to the Creed. As a problem of high speculative theology, the article might be couched in broad and ambiguous terms, and allowed to sink into reverential silence. The other inevitable question forced itself upon the mind, the popular mind as well as that of the clergy, almost in every service. Whenever the Nicene Creed was read or chanted, the omission of the words would strike the Latins with a painful and humiliating void; it was an admission of their presumption in enlarging the established Creed — the abasing confession that the Western Church, the Roman Church, had transcended its powers. To the Greek the unusual

¹ The Latin argued, *εἰ δὲ ὁμολογοῦντες ἡμεῖς οἱ Λατεῖνοι μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν καὶ πηγὴν καὶ ρίζαν τὸν Πάτερα τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, μὴ παύοντες δύο ἀρχάς, τις ἡ χρεια τοῦ ἀπαλείφειν προσθήκην.* — Ducas, 2. xxxi.

² Syropoulos, p. 237.

words jarred with equal dissonance on the ear; the compulsory repetition was a mark of galling subjection, of the cowardly abandonment of the rightful independence of his Church, as well as of truth and orthodoxy. On this point the Latins suffered the humiliation of having produced a copy of the Acts of the Second Council of Nicea, which included the contested words. It was a forgery so flagrant that they were obliged to submit to its rejection without protest.¹ The Greeks drew the natural conclusion that they would not scruple to corrupt their own documents.² The Latins were more fortunate or more skilful in some citations from St. Basil and other writers of authority. Their authenticity could not be disproved without awaiting the arrival of other copies from Constantinople. Throughout, the dispute rested on the Greek Fathers; the Greeks somewhat contemptuously avowed their ignorance of the Latin saints.

The Latins had the strength of strenuous union, the Greeks were weakened by discord. Already at Ferrara the more rigid Greeks had seen the accomplished Bessarion of Nicea desert the faithful Mark of Ephesus. On the question of Purgatory they had differed more widely than the conflicting Churches. Their quarrel now degenerated into coarse and personal altercation. "Why do I dispute any longer" (Bessarion so far forgot himself) "with a man possessed by an evil spirit?"³ Mark, in return, denounced Bessarion as a bastard and an apostate.

¹ The interpolation was traced up to the time of Charlemagne, no higher.

² Ἐλέγομεν γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, ὡς ἤδη ἔχομεν ἐλέγχειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τούτου, ὅτι ἐνοθεύθησαν καὶ τὰ ῥητὰ τῶν δυτικῶν ἀγίων. — Syrop. p. 171.

³ Syropulus, p. 257.

The Pope and the Emperor¹ were resolutely determined upon the union. Every art, all influence and authority, were put forth to compel the more refractory to obedience. If the Cardinalate was not yet bestowed or promised to the more obsequious Prelates, Bessarion of Nicea and Isidore of Russia, the appointments and allowances to the more pliant were furnished with punctuality and profusion, those of the contumacious parsimoniously if at all. The arrears of the disfavored again extended to many months; they were again threatened with starvation. Christopher, the Pope's former Legate at Constantinople, proposed altogether to withdraw the allowance from Mark of Ephesus, the Judas who ate the Pope's bread and conspired against him.² Rumors were spread that Mark was mad. It was skilfully suggested, it was plain to the simplest understanding, that the liberties of the Greeks, perhaps their lives, in a foreign land, were not their own; their return depended on the mercy or the generosity of their antagonists. They might be kept an indefinite time, prisoners, despised, starving prisoners. Their own poor resources had long been utterly exhausted; the Emperor, even the Patriarch, could make or enforce no terms for refractory subjects, who defied alike temporal and spiritual authority.

The Greeks met again and again in their private synod. The debates were long, obstinate, ^{Greeks in} furious; the holy councillors were almost ^{discussion.} committed in personal violence; the Emperor mingled

¹ The Emperor burst out into a furious invective against the Bishop of Heraclea, who had presumed to refute the Imperial arguments: Οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἀνασχυντῶν λέγεις ὑπὲρ σοὶ οὐκ ἔξεστι. Διότι ὑπάρχεις ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὑπαίδευτος καὶ βύβανσος καὶ χωρίτης. — P. 224.

² Syropulus, p. 251.

in the fray, overawing some to adulatory concessions, but not all.¹ The question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost was proposed for their accordance in the mildest and most disguised form; that of the addition to the Creed altogether eluded. There were twenty who declared themselves in favor of the union, twelve June 3. not content. But in subsequent meetings (every kind of influence was used, menaces, promises were lavished to obtain suffrages) the majority was gradually swelled by the admission of certain "Grammarians" to vote: the minority dwindled away by the secession of some Bishops through fear or favor, the disfranchisement of three of the cross-bearers and some obstinate monks, as not in holy orders. The Emperor determined that suffrages belonged only to Bishops and Archimandrites.² At length Mark of Ephesus stood alone, or with one partisan, Sophronius of Anchialus; even Sophronius seems to have dropped away; but in vain the Patriarch wasted all his eloquence on the adamantine Ephesian.

Yet the Emperor would not surrender the liberties of his Church without distinct stipulations as to the reward of his compliance.³ His sole motive for submission had been the security of his empire, of Constantinople now almost his whole empire.⁴ A treaty, June 2. negotiated by Isidore of Russia, was duly ratified and signed, with these articles. I. The Pope

¹ The Bishops of Mitylene and Lacedæmon almost fell teeth and nail on Mark of Ephesus: *Καὶ μόνον εἰς ὁδοῦς καὶ χέραν ὤρων διασπαράξαι αὐτὸν.* — P. 236.

² *Ἡγούμενοι.*

³ Gibbon has noted with his usual sarcasm the protest of the Emperor's dog, who howled fiercely and lamentably throughout his master's speech. — Syropulus, 266.

⁴ Syropulus, 261.

bound himself to supply ample means, ships and provisions, for the return of the Emperor and the Greeks. II. The Pope would furnish every year two galleys and three hundred men-at-arms for the defence of Constantinople. III. The ships which conveyed the pilgrims to the Holy Land were to touch at Constantinople. IV. In the Emperor's need the Pope should furnish twenty galleys for six months or ten for a year. V. If the Emperor should require land forces, the Pope would use all his authority with the Princes of the West to supply them.

The temporal treaty was signed. With weary haste they proceeded to perfect, to ratify, and to publish the spiritual treaty, which pretended to unite the East and West in holy communion. The Patriarch, who had long been suffering from age and sickness, just lived to see and to sign this first article of his great work. He died suddenly almost in the act of urging his followers to submission. He had already sent off some of his effects to Venice, and hoped to return (happily he did not return) to Constantinople. His obsequies were celebrated with great pomp; and in the Baptistery of Florence the stranger wonders to find the tomb of a Patriarch of Constantinople.

The strife seemed to be worn out with this more momentous question. The discomfited and discordant Greeks had no longer courage or will to contest further.¹ The three other points had already been partially discussed; even that perilous one, the supremacy

¹ There is a remarkable passage, in which Bessarion of Nicea took the opportunity, to the perplexity and astonishment of the Greeks, of asserting their absolute unity with the Latins as to the sole power of the hierarchy to consecrate the Eucharist and to ordain the clergy. — Syropulus, p. 295; but compare p. 278.

of the Pope, was passed, reserving only in vague and doubtful terms the rights of the Eastern Patriarchate. Death had silenced the remonstrant voice of the Patriarch. The final edict was drawn by common consent. One only difficulty remained which threatened seriously to disturb the peace. In whose names, on whose authority, should it address the world as a law of Christendom, that of the Emperor the heir of Justinian, or the Pope the successor of St. Peter? The Emperor yielded to a compromise, which seemed to maintain his dignity. It spoke in the name of the Pope Eugenius IV. with the consent of his dear son John Palæologus, Emperor of the Romans, and the representatives of his venerable brethren the Patriarchs. Earth and heaven were summoned to rejoice that the wall had fallen which had divided the Churches of the East and West. The Greeks and Latins are now one people. I. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, but as from one principle, by one operation. The words "from the Son" have been lawfully and with good reason inserted in the Creed. II. In the use of leavened or unleavened bread, each Church might maintain its usage. III. The souls of those who die in less than mortal sin are purified in purgatory, by what fire was not determined, but their sufferings may be shortened or alleviated by the prayers and alms of the faithful. V. The Roman Pontiff, as successor of St. Peter, has a primacy and government over the whole Catholic Church, but according to the Canons of the Church.¹ The rights and privileges of the other four great Patriarchs, Constantinople,

¹ About this there was a dispute, on which the Emperor threatened to break off the treaty. The Pope proposed "according to Scripture and the writings of the Saints." — P. 282.

Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, are inviolate and inviolable.

The Acts of the Council of Florence boast the signatures, on the part of the Latins, of the Pope, eight Cardinals, two Latin Patriarchs, of Jerusalem and Grado, two Bishops Ambassadors of the Duke of Burgundy, eight Archbishops, forty-seven Bishops, four Heads of Orders, forty-one Abbots, and the Archdeacon of Troyes. Among the Greeks were the Emperor, the Vicars of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, nineteen Archbishops and Bishops by themselves or by their proctors, the great Dignitaries of the Church of Constantinople, the Head of the Imperial Monastery, and four Abbots. Of these some were compelled to set their hands, the Ecclesiast fairly owns, speaking no doubt of himself among others, from fear. Such were the representatives of the Christian world. The Despot Demetrius still sternly refused: he was to reap his reward in popularity, hereafter to be dangerous to his brother's throne. He retired to Venice in sullen dignity.

The Act was published with imposing solemnity in the Cathedral of Florence. Nothing was wanting to the splendor of the ceremony, to the glory of the Pope. After *Te Deum* chanted in Greek, Mass celebrated in Latin, the Creed was read with the "*Filioque*." Syropulus would persuade himself and the world that the Greeks did not rightly catch the indistinct and inharmonious sounds. Then the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini ascended the pulpit and read the Edict in Latin, the Cardinal Bessarion in Greek. They descended and embraced, as symbolizing the indissoluble unity of the Church. The Edict (it was unusual) ended with no

anathema. Bessarion and Isidore, with the zeal of renegades, had urged the condemnation of their contumacious brethren: they were wisely overruled. Even Mark of Ephesus, whom the Pope would have visited for his stubborn pride (the brave old man adhered to his convictions in the face of the Pope and his Cardinals), was protected by the Emperor. The service in the Cathedral of Florence was in the Latin form, the Pope was on his throne, with his Cardinals, in all his superiority. Greek vanity had expected to impress the Latins by the more solemn majesty of their rites.¹ They proposed the next day a high Greek function, with the Pope present. The Pope coldly answered, that before they could be permitted in public, the rites must be rehearsed in private, in order that it might be seen whether there was anything presumptuously discordant with the Roman usage. The Greeks declined this humiliating mode of correcting the errors and innovations of the Roman ritual.²

Five copies of these Acts were made, and duly signed, that authentic proof of this union might never be wanting to perpetuate its memory to the latest time.

Thus closed the first, the great, Session of the Council of Florence. The Emperor with the Greek Clergy returned to Venice, and, after a long and fatiguing navigation, to Constantinople³ there to be received, not as the Saviour of the empire from the sword of the

¹ The only superiority which the Latins seemed obliged to own, was the splendor of the Greek dresses of silk. "A la maniera degli abiti Greci, pareva assai più grave, e più degna che quella de' Prelati Latini." — *Vespasiano*, Vit. Eugen. IV. Muratori, xxv. p. 261.

² Ἡμεῖς ἐθαυροῦμεν διορθῶσαι πολλὰ σφάλματα τῶν Λατινῶν. — *Syropoulos*, p. 299.

³ He embarked Oct. 19; arrived in Constantinople Feb. 1.

Turks, not as the wise and pious reconciler of religious dissension and the peace-maker of the Church, but as a traitor to his own imperial dignity, as a renegade, and an apostate. Already in Venice signs of rebellion had appeared. The Bishop of Heraclea and the Ecclesiast, compelled to officiate in St. Mark's, revenged themselves by chanting the Creed without the obnoxious interpolation, and by refusing to pray for the Pope.¹ During the voyage the Emperor encountered bitter complaints from the Greeks of the tyranny and exultation of the Latin Clergy. In Constantinople it was eagerly inquired whether they had returned victorious. They confessed with humble and bitter self-reproach that they had sold the faith; that they had yielded in base fear to the Franks.² Had they been scourged, imprisoned, put to the torture? they could not plead this excuse. It was openly said that, Judas-like, they had received money and sold the Lord. The Archbishop of Heraclea declared that he had been compelled to the base apostasy, and confessed his bitter remorse of conscience; he had rather his right arm had been cut off than that he had subscribed the union. At once the Monks and the women broke out into unrestrained fanaticism against the impious Azymites, who had treated the difference of leavened or unleavened bread as trivial and insignificant. The obsequious Bishop of Cyzicum, promoted to the Patriarchate, could not command the attendance of his own dignitaries without the mandate, without threats of severe punishment from the Emperor.³ He stood even then, in the midst of his sullen retinue, in Santa Sophia, with

¹ Syropulus, p. 315.

² Ducas, c. xxxi.

³ Syropulus.

hardly a single worshipper.¹ The churches where the clergy officiated who had favored the union, not merely in the metropolis but in the villages around, were deserted by their flocks.² The Despot Demetrius raised the standard of Greek orthodoxy in direct rebellion against his brother. His partisans excited the people everywhere, if to less violent, to as stubborn rebellion. Bold had been the Priest who had dared to interpolate the Creed with the hated clause. Even in Russia, the Cardinal Isidore (the wiser Bessarion returned to peace and honor in the West) was met with the same contemptuous, inflexible resistance.

A few short years had entirely obliterated all signs of the union in the East, excepting the more imbittered feeling of estrangement and hatred which rankled in the very depths of their hearts towards the Latin Church; and these feelings were only quenched in their blood. For, as they thus indignantly repudiated all connection with Rome, all subjection to Latin Christianity, the Pope and the Princes of Western Christendom thought no more of their treaty of succor and support against the Turks.

Only fifteen years after the return of the Emperor John Palæologus to the East, Constantinople was a Mohammedan city. St. Sophia, which disdained to be polluted by the "Filioque" in the Creed, resounded, unrebuked, with the Imaum's chant, "There is but one God, and Mohammed is his Prophet."

The sole lasting consequence of the Council of Florence, even in the West, was the fame acquired by Pope

¹ He demanded the reason of this from some of his refractory flock. *Διοτι ἠκολούθησας καὶ σὺ τῷ πατριάρχῃ καὶ ἐλατίνισας.* — P. 337.

² Phranza, p. 194. Laonicus Chalcondylas. Ducas, c. xxxi.

Eugenius, which he wanted neither the art nor the industry to propagate in the most magnificent terms. He, of all the successors of St. Peter, had beheld the Byzantine Emperor at his feet, had condescended to dictate terms of union to the Greeks, who had acknowledged the superior orthodoxy, the primacy of Rome. The splendid illusion was kept up by the appearance of ecclesiastical ambassadors—how commissioned, invested with what authority, none knew, none now know—from the more remote and barbarous churches of the East, from the uttermost parts of the Christian world. The Iberians, Armenians, the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria, the Chaldean Nestorians, the Ethiopians, successively rendered the homage of their allegiance to the one Supreme Head of Christendom.

CHAPTER XV.

CONTINUATION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE. POPE FELIX.

THE Council of Basle, frustrated in its endeavors to secure the advantage to itself of the treaty with the Eastern Emperor, looked on the negotiations at Ferrara and Florence with contemptuous disregard. Its hostility might seem imbibited by the success of the Pope in securing the recognition of the Emperor and the Greek Clergy. It was some months before the time when Eugenius triumphantly announced his union with the Byzantine Church, that the Council determined to proceed to the deposition of the Pope. They would before long advance to the more fatal and irrevocable step — the election of his successor.

The Council might seem, in its unshaken self-confidence, to despise the decline in its own importance, from the secession of so many of its more distinguished members, still more from the inevitable consequences of having raised vast expectations which it seemed utterly unable to fulfil. It affected an equable superiority to the defection of the great temporal powers, the haughty neutrality of Germany, and the rival synod of France at Bourges. Even the lesser temporal princes, who had hitherto supported the Council, the Spanish Kings, the Duke of Milan, seemed to shrink from the extreme and irrepealable act — the

deposition of the Pope. They began to urge more tardy, if not more temperate, counsels. The debates in the Council became stormy and tumultuous; the few great prelates encountered in bitter altercation. The Archbishop of Palermo, the representative of the King of Arragon, urged delay; he was supported by the Archbishop of Milan, and by others of rank and name. He endeavored to counteract the growing democratic tendencies of the Council, by asserting the sole and exclusive right of the Bishops to suffrage. This preliminary debate was long and obstinate.¹ At its close, after the speech of the Cardinal of Arles, a violent collision took place. The old Archbishop of Aquileia arose, and rashly said, "You do not know us Germans: if you go on thus, you will hardly come off without broken heads." The Archbishop of Palermo, Louis the Papal Prothonotary, and others, rose, and with one voice, exclaimed that the liberty of the Council was threatened. He called on the Count of Thierstein, the Emperor's representative, who still had his seat in the Council, for his protection. The Count solemnly declared that the peace should be maintained. He was supported by the magistrates and citizens of Basle, who were proud that their town was the seat of the Council, and declared that it should not be disturbed. Still, as the President went on to read the decree, he was interrupted by shouts and unseemly

¹ See the whole in *Æneas Sylvius*. Comment. lib. i. Opera, p. 23. The speech of the Cardinal of Arles is of many folio pages. He rashly said that the Archbishop of Milan, though a prelate of the greatest weight and dignity, was no great orator. "As good an orator as you a president," burst in the indignant Lombard. The Cardinal of Arles bore the interruption with patience, and went calmly on (p. 26). He soothed the Bishops with great skill, who were jealous of the suffrages of the inferior clergy. He compared the Council to the Spartans at Thermopylæ.

noises. "A miracle," exclaimed the Archbishop of Lyons; "the dumb speak, Bishops who never uttered a word before are now become loquacious." The Cardinal Archbishop of Arles, the President, stood quite alone of his Order, almost alone among the Prelates of the highest rank, in his inflexible fidelity to the Council. His dignity, his unalterable temper, his promptitude and eloquence, which excited the most unbounded admiration, his consummate ability, by which, though a Frenchman, he out-manceuvred the subtle Italians, still maintained his sway. His chief supporters, though of inferior rank, were men of fame for learning. He always happily chose his time: on the second meeting, he carried his point against the Archbishop of Palermo and all the Spanish and Milanese Prelates, who withdrew angry but baffled. "Twice," said the Archbishop in Italian, meaning, twice we have been beaten, or twice overreached.

As the session drew on which was to determine the question of deposition, the Bishops — some from timidity, some from dislike of the proceeding — shrunk away. Of the Spanish Prelates there was not one; from Italy one Bishop and one Abbot, of mitred Prelates from the other two kingdoms (England took no part in the Council) only twenty; their place was filled by clergy inferior in rank, but, according to Æneas Sylvius, much superior in learning. The Cardinal of Arles was embarrassed, but not disheartened, by this defection. The relics of many famous Saints were collected, borne by the Priests of his party through the city, and actually introduced into the hall of council in the place of the absent Bishops.¹ At the solemn

¹ "Plurimasque sanctorum reliquias totâ urbe perquiri jussit, ac per sa

appeal to the Saints in bliss, a transport of profound devotion seized the assembly; they all burst into tears. The Baron, Conrad of Winsperg, <sup>May 16.
A.D. 1489.</sup> the Imperial Commissioner, wept the loudest, and declared that he derived ineffable consolation in the execution of his arduous duty. Though so few Bishops were there, never were the seats so full. Proctors of Bishops, Archdeacons, Provosts, Priors, Presbyters, sat to the number of four hundred or more. Nor did the Council ever proceed with such calm and dignified decency. There was no word of strife or altercation, only mutual exhortation to defend the freedom of the Church.¹

The edict passed almost by acclamation. This act for the deposition of Eugenius condemned the Pope, who was now boasting the success of his inappreciable labors for the union of the whole Church, as a notorious disturber of the peace and unity of the Church, as guilty of simony and perjury, as an incorrigible schismatic, an obstinate heretic, a dilapidator of the rights and possessions of the Church.² All Christians were absolved from their oaths and obligations of fealty, and warned that they must neither render obedience nor counsel, nor receive favor from the deprived Gabriel Condolmieri. All his acts, censures, inhibitions, constitutions, were declared void and of none effect. The decree of course abrogated all the boasted acts of the

cerdotum manus in sessione portatas, absentium Episcoporum locum tenere." — *Æneas Sylvius*, lib. ii. p. 43.

¹ "Quos inter nullum unquam probrum, nulla rixa, nulla unquam contentio fuit: sed alter alterum in professione fidei hortabatur, unanimisque omnium esse consensus ad defendendam Ecclesiam videbatur." — *Ibid.*

² The decree is dated May 26. — Labbe. According to the Continuator of Fleury (see *Patrici. Act. Concil. Basil.*), June 25; the very day on which was announced the union of the Greek and Latin churches.

Council of Florence. To the astonishment of the Council itself, the ambassadors of the Emperor and of the King of France, the Bishop of Lubeck and the Archbishop of Tours, made almost an apology for their absence in their masters' name, approved the act of the Council and declared Pope Eugenius IV. an enemy to the truth.¹

It was thought but decent to interpose some delay between the act for the deposition of Eugenius and the election of his successor. It was determined to wait two months. During those two months the plague, which had raged in the Pope's Council at Ferrara, with impartial severity broke out at Basle. The mortality, not in Basle alone, but in many cities of Southern Germany, was terrible.² In Basle the ordinary cemeteries were insufficient; huge pits were dug to heap in the dead. Many of the Fathers died, protesting in their death, with their last breath, and with the Holy Eucharist on their lips, their fearless adherence to the Council, and praying for the conversion of those who still acknowledged Gabriel for the Pope.³ The aged Patriarch of Aquileia rejoiced that he should bear into the other world the tidings of the deposition of Eugenius. Æneas Sylvius was among the rare examples of recovery from the fatal malady. But the Fathers stood nobly to their post; they would not risk the breaking-up of the Council, even by the temporary abandonment of the city. The Cardinal of Arles set the example; his secretary, his chamberlain, died in his house.

¹ Session XXXIV. apud Labbe, sub ann. 1439.

² The Bishop of Lubeck died between Buda and Vienna; the almoner of the King of Arragon in Switzerland; the Bishop of Evreux in Strasbourg; a great Abbot in Spire.

³ Æneas Sylvius, lib. ii. p. 47.

The pressing entreaties, prayers, remonstrances of his friends, who urged that on his safety depended the whole influence of the Council, were rejected with tranquil determination. The malediction fulminated against the Council by Eugenius at Florence disturbed not their equanimity. Even at this hour they quailed not. They were described as a horde of robbers ; “at Basle all the devils in the world had assembled to consummate the work of iniquity, and to set up the abomination of desolation in the Church of God.” All Cardinals, Prelates, were excommunicated, deposed, menaced with the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. All their decrees were annulled, the brand of heresy affixed on all their proceedings. Against this furious invective the Fathers at Basle published an apology, not without moderation.

The plague had mitigated its ravages ; the two months had fully expired ; the Council proceeded to the election of a new Pope. The Cardinal of Arles was alone entitled by his rank to be an Elector ; in his name there was unanimous assent. It was proposed that three persons should nominate thirty-two, who with the Cardinal should form the Electoral College. The triumvirate were men whose humble rank is the best testimony to their high estimation. John, called the Greek, the Abbot of an obscure Cistercian convent in Scotland ; John of Segovia, Archdeacon of Villa Viciosa, Thomas de Corcelles, Canon of Amiens. Lest the most important Nation, the Germans, should take offence at their exclusion, they were empowered to choose a fourth : they named Christian, Provost of St. Peter's of Brun in the diocese of Olmutz, a German by birth.

These theological triumvirs with their colleague named twelve Bishops, seven Abbots, five distinguished divines, nine Doctors of Canon or Civil Law.¹ They were impartially chosen from all the four Nations, Germany, France, Spain, Italy. England alone, unrepresented in the Council, was of course unrepresented in the Conclave.

The Conclave was conducted with the utmost regularity and a studious imitation of the forms
37th Session.
Oct. 24. observed by the College of Cardinals. The election, after not many days, was without serious strife; it struck Christendom with astonishment. It
38th Session.
Oct. 28. was not a Prelate whose vigor and character might guarantee and conduct the reformation in the Church, on the expectation of which rested all the confidence of the world in the Council of Basle; not a theologian of consummate learning, not a monk of rigid austerity, it was not even a Churchman of tried and commanding abilities. It was a temporal sovereign, who, weary of his crown, had laid it down, but was not unwilling to plunge again into the more onerous business of a Pope: who had retired not into the desert, but to a kind of villa-convent on the beautiful shores of the Lake Geneva, and whose life at best decent and calmly devout, if not easy and luxurious, had none of the imposing rigor of the old founders of monastic orders. Amadeus of Savoy was summoned from his retreat at Thonon to ascend the Papal throne.²

¹ The numbers in *Æneas Sylvius* are perplexing. The twelve Bishops, including the Cardinal, were to represent the twelve Apostles. But he names many more. The account in the *Acts of Patricius* varies in many but not very important particulars.

² *Æneas Sylvius* (but we must begin to hear *Æneas* with more mistrust) attributes the elevation of Amadeus to a deep-laid plot. "Amadeus qui se

Objections were raised that Amadeus of Savoy was not in holy orders ; that he had been married and had children. These difficulties were overruled, and yielded easily to the magnificent eulogies passed on the piety, charity, holiness of the hermit of Ripaille. Some of the secret motives for this singular choice are clear enough. The Pope of Basle must be a Pope, at least for a time, without Papal revenues. Italy, all the patrimony of St. Peter which acknowledged the Pope, was in the possession of Eugenius, and showed no inclination to revolt to the Council. If any of the Transalpine sovereigns would recognize the Antipope, none was likely to engage in a crusade to place him on the throne in the Vatican. The only means of supporting his dignity would be the taxation of the Clergy, which his poor partisans could ill bear ; the more wealthy and powerful would either refuse, or resent and pass over to the opposite camp. Amadeus, at first at least, might maintain his own court, if not in splendor, in decency. This, however, was a vain hope. The first act of the Council after the election was the imposition of a tax of a fifth penny on all ecclesiastics, for the maintenance of the state of the new Pope. Perhaps the unpopularity of this measure was alleviated by the impossibility of levying it. It was an idle display of unprofitable generosity. If Christendom

futurum Papam sperabat " (p. 76). "*Sapientiâ præditus dicebatur qui annis jam octo et amplius simulatam religionem accepisset, ut papatum consequi posset.*" He makes Amadeus too far-sighted. Æneas assigns a curious speech to Cardinal Cæsarini. "I was afraid that they would have chosen a poor and a good man ; then there had been indeed danger. It is that which stirs the hearts of men and removes mountains. This man hopes to accumulate the wealth of Pope Martin" — Martin's wealth had passed into a proverb — "not to spend his own money." The election, Nov. 5 ; confirmed, Nov. 17.

had been burdened with the maintenance of two Popes it would have wakened up from its indifference, coalesced in favor of one, or discarded both.

A deputation of the most distinguished Churchmen in Basle, the Cardinal of Arles at their head (he was attended by the Count of Thierstein, the Imperial Commissioner), proceeded to the royal hermitage, there to announce to Amadeus his elevation to the Papal See. Amadeus assumed, if he did not feel, great reluctance. If his retirement and seclusion had not been mere weariness of worldly affairs, and if he was not by this time as weary of his seclusion as he had been of the world, when Amadeus looked down on the shadow of his peaceful retreat, reflected in the blue and unbroken waters of the lake below, he might have serious misgivings in assuming the busy, invidious, and, at least of old, perilous function of an Antipope.¹ He had to plunge into an interminable religious war, with the administration, though without power, of the spiritual affairs of half Christendom, the implacable hatred of the other half. Some difficulties were raised, but not those of a deep or earnest mind. He demurred about the form of the oath, the change of the name, the loss of his hermit's beard. He yielded the two first points, took the oath, and the name of Felix V.;² the last only on finding out himself, when he appeared as Pope in the neighboring town of Thonon, the unseemliness of a thick-bearded Pope among a retinue of shaven ecclesiastics.

¹ It was his avarice which caused the delay, says the unfriendly *Æneas*. Yet it was natural in him to say, "You have passed a decree suppressing Annates: how is the Pope to be maintained? Am I to expend my patrimony, and so disinherit my sons?" — Fea, p. 78.

² Accepts, Dec. 17.

Though enthroned in the Church of S^t. Maurice, some months elapsed before his triumphant June 24, 1440. progress through Switzerland to his coronation at Basle. He had created five Cardinals, who assisted the Cardinal of Arles in the imposing ceremony first of his consecration as Bishop, afterwards his coronation as Pope; his two sons, the Duke of Savoy and the Count of Geneva, an unusual sight at a Papal inauguration stood by his side. Fifty thousand spectators beheld the stately ceremony: the tiara which he wore was of surpassing cost and splendor said to be worth 30,000 gold crowns.¹

So then for the last time Christendom beheld the strife of Pope and Antipope, each on their respective thrones, hurling spiritual thunders against each other. The indignation of Eugenius knew no bounds. His denunciations contained all and more than all the maledictions which were laid up in the Papal armory against usurping rivals. The Fathers of Basle repelled them, if with less virulent, with not less provoking contempt.

But Christendom heard these arguments and recriminations with mortifying indifference. That which some centuries ago would have arrayed kingdom against kingdom, and divided each kingdom within itself, the sovereigns against the hierarchy, or the hierarchy in civil feud, now hardly awoke curiosity. No omen so sure of the decline of the sacerdotal power; never again had it vital energy enough for a schism.

The Transalpine kingdoms indeed took different parts but with such languid and inactive zeal, that as to the smaller states it is difficult without close investigation to

¹ *Æneas Sylvius, Hist. Concil. Basil. l. ii.*

detect their bias. France had already in her synod at Bourges declared in favor of the Council, but expressed cold and discouraging doubts as to its powers of deposing Pope Eugenius and electing another Pontiff. The King spoke of Felix V. as of Monsieur de Savoye, suggested the summoning another Council in some city of France, but took no measure to enforce his suggestion. England was occupied, as indeed was France, with its own internal contests. The King of Arragon alone took an active part, but on both sides, and for his own ends. The kingdom of Naples was his sole object; he would wrest that realm from the feeble pretensions of René of Anjou. At first the devoted ally of Felix, he would transport the Antipope to the shores of Naples, having subdued the kingdom to himself under the Papal investiture, march to Rome with his triumphant forces, and place the Antipope in the chair of St. Peter. Amadeus wisely shrunk from this desperate enterprise. The King of Arragon, in a year or two, had changed his game. The Pope Eugenius scrupled not, at the hazard of estranging France, to abandon the helpless Angevine. Alfonso of Arragon became convinced of the rightful title of Eugenius to the Pontificate.

Germany maintained the most cool and deliberate apathy. At three successive Diets at Mentz,¹ at Nuremberg, at Frankfort, appeared the envoys of Basle and of Rome, of Felix and of Eugenius, men of the most consummate eloquence. At Mentz John Bishop

¹ Mentz, Feb. 1440. At Mentz the Diet, before the election of the Emperor Frederick III., in the disdainful assertion of their neutrality, published a declaration in which they sedulously avoided the word Pope. They spoke of *Ecclesia Dei*, *Ecclesia Romana*, *Sedes Apostolica*, as the "*cui facienda est adhesio*." — Dax, *Nicolas von Cusa*, p. 223.

of Segovia on the part of Basle, Nicolas of Cusa on the part of Rome, pleaded the cause of their respective masters: they cited authorities which of old would have commanded awful reverence, precedents which would have been admitted as irrefragable, but were heard with languid indifference. At Nuremberg with Nicolas of Cusa stood the Archbishop of Tarento Nov. 30, 1440. and the famous Dominican Torquemada, on the side of Basle the Patriarch of Aquileia. At A.D. 1441. Mentz¹ again Nicolas de Cusa took the lead for the Pope, the Archbishop of Palermo for the Council. The Diet on each occasion relapsed into its ostentatious neutrality, which it maintained at subsequent meetings.² Even the aggressive measure A.D. 1443. ventured at length by Eugenius, the degradation of the Archbishops of Cologne and Trèves, as adherents of the heretical Council, and the usurping pseudo-pope, might have passed away as an ineffectual menace; no one would have thought of dispossessing these powerful Prelates. If he might hope to raise a strife in Germany by appointing Prelates of noble or rich German houses, there was danger lest the nation might resent this interference with the German Electorate; it might lead to the renunciation of his authority. He must look for other support. To Cologne he named

¹ Dax has given Nicolas de Cusa's speech at length. His speech and that of the Archbishop of Palermo are in Wurdwein.

² The speech of Nicolas of Cusa shows the course of argument adopted to annul the pretensions and blast the character of Felix. The whole is represented as an old and deep-laid conspiracy on his part. The Council, the Conclave had been crowded with his obsequious vassals (the four Italian Bishops were, it is true, those of Vercelli, Turin, Aosta, and another); his reluctance to assume the tiara was hypocritical effrontery; even his former abdication of his throne a base simulation of humility.

the nephew, to Trèves the natural son, of the Duke of Burgundy.

The Schism seemed as if it would be left to die out of itself, or, if endowed with inextinguishable, obstinate vitality, be kept up in unregarded insignificance. Some of the Fathers of Basle still remained in the city, but had ceased their sessions.¹ The Council of Florence was prorogued to Rome. Eugenius was in undisturbed possession of Italy; Felix in his court at Lausanne, or Geneva. The Popes might still hate, they could not injure, hardly molest each other; they might wage a war of decrees, but no more.

One man alone by his consummate address and subtlety, by his indefatigable but undiscerned influence, restored the Papacy to Italy, never but for one short reign (that of Adrian VI. of Utrecht) to depart from it, himself in due time to receive the reward of his success in nothing less than the Popedom. Eugenius and his successor Pope Nicolas V. enjoyed the fame and the immediate advantage of the discomfiture of the Council of Basle, of its inglorious dissolution. But the real author of that dissolution, of its gradual degradation in the estimation of Europe, of the alienation of the Emperor from its cause; he who quietly drove Pope Felix to his abdication, and even added firmness and resolution to the obstinate and violent opposition of Pope Eugenius, was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

¹ Last Session. The 44th. May, 1433.

CHAPTER XVI.

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINI. DISSOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF BASLE.

THE life of Æneas Sylvius is the history of the dissolution of the Council of Basle ; and not only so, but as an autobiography of an Italian, a Churchman, a Cardinal, at length a Pope, the most valuable part of the Christian history of his times — that of the opinions, manners, judgments, feelings of mankind. Contrast it with the rise of high ecclesiastics in former times !

The house of Piccolomini had been among the noblest of Sienna, lords of fortresses and castles. On the rise of the popular government in that city, the Piccolominis sunk with the rest of the nobles. Yet the grandfather of Æneas possessed an ample estate. He died early, leaving his wife pregnant. The estate was dissipated by negligent or improvident guardians ; the father of Æneas married a noble virgin, but without dowry, except the burdensome one — extraordinary fertility. She frequently bore twins, and in the end had twenty-two children. Ten only grew up, and Piccolomini retired to the quiet town of Corsignano, to bring up in humble condition his large family. The plague swept off all but Æneas Sylvius and two sisters.

Æneas Sylvius was born October 18, 1405. His

third baptismal name was Bartholomew, that of the Apostle of India. His infancy was not uneventful: at three years old he fell from a wall, was taken up, as supposed, with a mortal wound in his head; at eight was tossed by a bull. At the age of twenty-two he left his father's house, heir to no more than his noble name, went to Sienna, was maintained by his relations, and studied law and letters. The war between Florence and Sienna drove him from his native city to seek his fortunes. Dominico Capranica, named as Cardinal by Pope Martin V., rejected by Pope Eugenius, espoused the cause of the Council of Basle. He engaged the young Piccolomini as his secretary. After a perilous voyage Æneas reached Genoa, travelled to Milan, where he saw the great Duke Filippo Maria, and passed the snowy St. Gothard to Basle. Capranica, though he resumed his Cardinalate on the authority of the Council, was too poor to keep a secretary. Æneas found employment in the same office, first with Nicodemo Scaligero, Bishop of Freisingen, son of the Lord of Verona; him he accompanied to Frankfort: afterwards with Bartolomeo Visconti, Bishop of Novara. With the Bishop of Novara he returned to Italy; by his own account, through his eloquence obtained the Rectorship of the University of Pavia for a Novarese of humble birth, against a Milanese of noble family and powerful connections. With the Bishop of Novara he went to Florence, to the Court of Pope Eugenius: he visited the famous Piccinino, and his own kindred at Sienna. On his return to Florence he found his master, the Bishop of Novara, under a charge of capital treason.¹ The Bishop and his secretary Piccolomini

¹ Voigt, *Leben Ænea Sylvio*, p. 80 (Berlin, 1856), has attempted to un-

found refuge under the protection of the Cardinal of Santa Croce (Albergati). The Cardinal was sent as Legate to France, to reconcile the Kings of France and England, Charles VII. and Henry VI. In attendance on the Cardinal Æneas passed a third time through Milan, crossed the St. Bernard, and descended on the Lake of Geneva. At Thonon he saw Amadeus of Savoy, afterwards the Pope Felix V. of the Council of Basle, in his hermitage, living, as he says, a life of pleasure rather than of penance.¹ They proceeded to Basle, not yet at open war with Pope Eugenius, dropped down the Rhine to Cologne, took horse to Aix-la-Chapelle, Liege, Louvain, Douay, Tournay, to Arras. The Cardinal di Santa Croce began his difficult function of mediating between the French, the English, and the Burgundians.

Æneas was despatched on a special mission to Scotland, to restore a certain prelate to the favor of the King. He went to Calais. The suspicious English would not permit him to proceed or to go back. Fortunately the Cardinal of Winchester arrived from Arras, and obtained for him permission to embark. But the English looked with jealousy on the secretary of the Cardinal of Santa Croce, whom they accused of conspiring to alienate Philip of Burgundy from their cause. He was refused letters of safe-conduct; he must be employed in some hostile intrigue with the Scots. During this delay Æneas visited the wonders of populous and most wealthy London. He saw the

reveal a deep plot against Eugenius IV. It is questionable whether the Bishop of Novara was not treacherous both to the Pope and to the Visconti, whose favor he was reinstated.

¹ "Magis voluptuosam quam poenitentialem."

noble church of St. Paul's, the sumptuous tombs of the kings at Westminster, the Thames, with the rapid ebb and flow of its tide, and the bridge like a city.¹ But of all things, the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury most excited his amazement, covered with diamonds, fine double pearls,² and carbuncles. No one offered less than silver at this shrine. He crossed to Flanders, went to Bruges, took ship at Ecluse, the most frequented port in the West, was blown towards the coast of Norway, encountered two terrible storms, one of fourteen hours, one of two nights and a day. The sailors were driven so far north that they did not know the stars. The twelfth day a lucky north wind brought them to Scotland. In a fit of devout gratitude Æneas walked barefoot ten miles to Our Lady at Whitechurch, but suffered so much from exhaustion and numbed feet that he hardly got to the court. He was received by the King with great favor, obtained the object of his mission, his expenses were paid, and he was presented with fifty nobles and two horses for his journey.

The Italian describes Scotland as a cold country, producing little corn, almost without wood. "They dig out of the earth a kind of sulphurous stone, which they burn." Their cities have no walls, their houses are mostly built without mortar, the roofs of turf, the doors of the cottages bulls' hides. The common people

¹ He saw also a village, where men were *said* to be born with tails.

² Unionibus.

"And in his cup an *union* shall he throw
Richer than that which four successive kings
On Denmark's throne have worn."

Hamlet, v. 2.

—See Nares's Glossary.

are poor and rude, with plenty of flesh and fish; bread is a delicacy. The men are small and bold; the women of white complexion, disposed to sexual indulgence.¹ They had only imported wine.² They export to Flanders hides, wool, salt-fish and pearls.³ The Scots were delighted by nothing so much as abuse of the English. Scotland was divided into two parts: one cultivated (the lowlands); one forest (the highlands) without cornfields. The forest Scots spoke a different language, and lived on the barks of trees.⁴ During the winter solstice, the time when Æneas was there, the days were only four hours long.

Æneas had suffered enough in his sea voyages; he determined to run all hazards, and find his way through England. He was fortunate in his resolution: the ship in which he was about to embark foundered at the mouth of the haven. The captain, who was returning to Flanders to be married, with all the passengers and crew, were drowned in sight of shore. Æneas set off disguised as a merchant. He passed the Tweed in a boat, entered a large town about sunset, found lodging in a cottage where he was housed, and supped with the parish priest. He had plenty of broth, geese and fowls; neither wine nor bread. All the women of the town crowded to see him, as to see a negro or an Indian in Italy. They asked who he was, whether he

¹ Æneas adds that kissing women in Scotland meant no more than shaking hands in Italy. Like Erasmus later in England, he drew Italian conclusions from Northern manners.

² Their horses were small hackneys, mostly geldings. They neither carried nor combed them. They had no bridles!

³ Margaritas.

⁴ He says also that there were no woods in Scotland. Rooks (*cornices*) were newly introduced, and therefore the trees whereon they built belonged to the King's Exchequer!

was a Christian. Æneas had been warned of the scanty fare which he would find on his journey, and had provided himself in a certain monastery (there no doubt alone such luxuries could be found) with some loaves of bread and a measure of red wine. This heightened the wonder of the barbarians, who had never seen wine nor white bread. Some women with child began to handle the bread and smell the wine. Æneas was too courteous not to gratify their longings, and gave them the whole. The supper lasted till the second hour of the night, when the priest, his host, and his children, and all the men, took leave of Æneas, and said that they must retire to a certain tower a long way off for fear of the Scots, who, on the ebb of the tide, were wont to cross over and plunder. No entreaties could induce them to take Æneas with them, nor any of their women, though many of them were young girls and handsome matrons. The enemy would do them no harm: the borderers' notions of harm were somewhat peculiar.¹ The Italian remained with his two servants, a single guide, and a hundred women, who sat round the fire all night spinning hemp and talking with his interpreter. After great part of the night was passed, there was a violent barking of dogs and cackling of geese. The women ran away, the guide with them, and there was as great confusion as if the enemy were there. Æneas thought it most prudent to stay in his chamber (it was a stable), lest, being quite ignorant of the ways, he might run into the

¹ "Qui stuprum inter mala non ducunt." It must be remembered that Æneas picked up all he learned through an interpreter, probabiy a man who knew a few words of bad Latin. I owe perhaps an apology for inserting this scene, so irresistibly characteristic, if not quite in its place. Walter Scott, if I remember, had seen it in his multifarious reading.

arms of the mosstroopers. Presently the women and the guide returned: it was a false alarm.

Æneas set out the next morning. When he arrived at Newcastle (said to be a work of the Cæsars) he seemed to have returned to the habitable world, so rugged, wild, and bleak, was the whole Border. At Durham he visited the tomb of the venerable Bede. At York, a large and populous city, there was a church famous throughout the world for its size and architecture, with a most splendid shrine, and with glass walls (the rich and large windows) between very slender clustered pillars. (Had Æneas seen none of the German or Flemish Gothic cathedrals?) On his way southward he fell in with one of the judges of the realm, returning to his court in London. The judge began to talk of the business in Arras, and, not suspecting who Æneas was, to abuse the Cardinal of Santa Croce as a wolf in sheep's clothing. In the company of the judge, who, had he known who he was, would have committed him to prison, he arrived safe in London. There he found a royal proclamation that no foreigner should leave the realm without a passport, which he cared not to ask for. He got away by bribing the officers, a matter of course, as such personages never refuse hard money. He crossed from Dover to Calais, thence to Basle and to Milan. Finding that the Cardinal of Santa Croce had been sent back from Florence, and had passed by the Valley of the Adige, and over the Arlberg to Basle, he returned over the Alps by Brig, and joined his master at Basle.

Æneas was an Italian in his passions, and certainly under no austere, monkish self-control. His morals were those of his age and country. His letters are full

of amatory matters, in the earlier of which, as he by no means counsels his friends to severe restraint, he does not profess to set them an example. Licentiousness seems to be a thing of course. He was not yet in holy orders: to do him justice, as yet he shrank from that decided step, lest it should involve him in some difficulties.¹ His confessions are plain enough; he makes no boast of constancy.² But the most unblushing avowal of his loose notions appears in a letter to his own father, whom he requests to take charge of a natural son. The mother of his son was an Englishwoman whom he met at Strasburg, of no great beauty, but who spoke Italian with great ease and sweetness. "It was the beauty of her eloquence by which Cleopatra inthrall'd not Mark Antony only, but Julius Cæsar." He anticipates his father's objection to the sinfulness of his conduct, in being a parent without being a husband. He had done only what every one else did. God had made him prone to desire: he did not pretend to be holier than David, or wiser than Solomon. He borrows the language of Terence — "Shall I, weak man that I am, not do that which so many great men have done?" But his examples are not the gods of the heathen lover in the comedy, but Moses, Aristotle, and some good Christians.³ Let us hastily

¹ "Cavi ne me sacer ordo involveret." — Epist. 1.

² "Ego plures vidi amavique fœminas, quarum exinde potitus, magnum tœdium suscepi." — Epist. xlv. Compare the coarse pleasantry, Epist. lxii. He was averse to German women: he could not speak German.

³ "Mecumque quis reprehendit, inquam, si ego humuncio faciam, quod maximi viri non sunt aspernati. Interdum Moysen, interdum Aristotelem, nonnunquam Christianos in exemplum sumebam." — Epist. xv. The publication, or at least the admission of this letter into a collection published after the Popedom of Æneas, is singular enough. But even this letter is modesty compared to Epist. xxiii.

despatch this, if not the least curious, not the most edifying passage in the life of the future Pope. Later in life he was seized with a paroxysm of virtue, and wrote some letters on such subjects in a more grave and ecclesiastical tone. In an epistle written at the approach of Lent, he urges his friend to flee all woman-kind, as a fatal pestilence. When you look on a woman you look on the devil. He had himself erred often, too often; and he acknowledges that he had become more correct, not from severe virtue, but from the advance, it must have been, of premature age. He consoled himself, however, for one vice which he could not indulge, by another. The votary of Venus (his own words) had become the votary of Bacchus. To his new god he will be faithful to death. Æneas must then have been between thirty-five and forty years old.¹

He was forty when he wrote his celebrated Romance, Euryalus and Lucretia, a romance with neither incident nor invention;² in its moral tone and in the warmth of its descriptions, as in its prolixity, a novel of Boccaccio, but without his inimitable grace; yet Æneas no doubt thought that he infinitely surpassed Boccaccio's vulgar Italian by his refined and classical Latinity. In the penitential Letter on this subject, in later life (after

¹ "Tum quoque et illud verum est languescere vires meas, canis aspersus sum, aridi nervi sunt, ossa cariosa, rugis corpus aratum est. Nec ulli ego feminae possum esse voluptati, nec voluptatem mihi afferre femina potest. Baccho magis quam Veneri parebo: vinum me alit, me juvat, me oblectat, me beat: hic liquor suavis mihi erit usque ad mortem. Namque ut fateor, magis me Venus fugitat, quam ego illam horreo." The letter (Epist. xcii.) is written to John Freund, Prothonotary of Cologne, not long after the diet of Nuremberg, A.D. 1442.

² The disgraceful history is probably a true one.

he was Pope !) the lingering vanity of the author still struggles with his sense of decency.¹

So, then, the Siennese adventurer had visited almost every realm of Northern Europe, France, Germany, Flanders, Scotland, England; he is in the confidence of Cardinals, he is in correspondence with many of the most learned and influential men in Christendom.

No sooner was Æneas fixed at Basle, than his singular aptitude for business, no doubt his fluent and perspicuous Latin, his flexibility of opinion, his rapidly growing knowledge of mankind, his determination to push his fortunes, his fidelity to the master in whose service he happened to be, opened the way to advancement; offices, honors, rewards crowded upon him. He was secretary,² first reporter of the proceedings, then held the office as writer of the epistles of the Council.³ He was among the twelve Presidents chosen by the Council. The office of these duodecimvirs was to prepare all business for the deliberation of the Council; nothing could be brought forward without their previous sanction, nor any one admitted to the Council till they had examined and approved his title. He often presided over his department, which was that of faith. The leaden seal of the Council was often in his custody. During his career he was ambassador from the Council three times to Strasburg, twice to Constance, twice to

¹ Epist. cccxv. There were two things in the book, a too lascivious love-story and an edifying moral. Unhappily many readers dweilt on the first; hardly any, alas! attended to the latter. "Ita impravatum est atque obfuscum infelix mortalium genus." He adds, "Nec privatum hominem pluris facite quam Pontificem; Æneam rejicite, Pium suscipite."

² Scriba.

³ Abbreviator major.

Frankfort, once to Trent, later to the Emperor Albert, and to persuade Frederick III. to espouse the cause of the Council.

His eloquence made him a power. His first appearance with a voice in the Council seems to have been in the memorable debate on the prorogation of the Council to Italy. We have heard that, while the Pope insisted on the removal of the Council to Florence or Udine, the Council would remove only to Avignon. The Duke of Milan, by his ambassadors, urged the intermediate measure, the adjournment to the city of Pavia. But his ambassador, Isidore Bishop of Rossano, was but an indifferent orator. He talked so foolishly that they were obliged to silence him. Æneas had been twice or three times at Milan; he was not averse to make friends at that powerful Court; nor was he disinclined by taking a middle course to wait the issue of events. He obtained permission of the President, the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, and urged in a speech of two hours, which excited the greatest admiration, the claims of Pavia against Florence, Udine, and Avignon. His zeal was not unrewarded. The Archbishop presented him to the Provostship of St. Lawrence in Milan. His rival Isidore remonstrated against the appointment of a stranger. He protested before the Council; the Council was unanimously in favor of Æneas. He went to Milan, but found that the Chapter had already elected a Provost of the noble house of Landriano, whom he found in actual possession. But the Duke, the Archbishop, and the Court were all-powerful; the intruder was expelled. At Milan Æneas was seized with a fever, which lasted seventy-five days, and was subdued with great dif-

ficulty.¹ On his return to Basle, he recovered his health so far as to be able to preach the commemoration sermon on the day of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. This sermon by one not in orders was opposed by the theologians, but met with great success.

The war had now broken out between the Pope and the Council; there was no middle ground; every one must choose his side. None, so long as he was in the service of the Council, and the Council in the ascendant, so bold, so loyal a partisan, or with such lofty conceptions of the superiority of the Council over the Pope, as Æneas Piccolomini. As historian of the Council, he asserts its plenary authority. The reasons which he assigns for undertaking this work are characteristic. He had begun to repent that he had wasted so much time in the idle and unrewarded pursuits of poetry, oratory, history. Was he still to live improvident as the birds of the air or the beasts of the field? Was he never to be in possession of money, the owner of an estate? The true rule of life is, that a man at twenty should strive to be great, at thirty prudent, at forty rich. But, alas! the bias was too strong: he must write history.

Throughout that history he is undisguisedly, inflexibly, hostile to Eugenius IV.² He sums up with great force and clearness, irrefragably, as he asserts, to his own mind, irrefragably it should be to the reason of men, the whole argument for the supremacy of the

¹ He relates that a certain drug was administered, which appeared to fail in its operation. He was about to take a second dose, when the first began to work: "ut nonaginta vicibus assurgere cogeretur."

² The reader must not confound two distinct histories, one, that published in Brown, Fasciculus, and in his Works; the other by Fea, in Roms, as late as the year 1822. I cite this as "Fea."

Council over the Pope. Words are wanting to express his admiration of the President of the Council, the Cardinal Archbishop of Arles: his opponents are secret or timid traitors to the highest Church principles. Eugenius IV. sinks to plain Gabriel Condolmieri.¹ Æneas does not disguise his contempt. He reproaches the Pope with perfidy, as seeking either to dissolve the Council or to deprive it of its liberty. He is severe against the perjury of those who had deserted the Council to join the Pope. Nicolas of Cusa, the *Hercules* of the apostasy, is guilty of schism. So he continues to the end: still he is the ardent panegyrist of the Cardinal of Arles, after the declaration of the heresy of Pope Eugenius, after the deposition of that Pope, even after the election of Pope Felix.

On the death of the Emperor Sigismund, Albert of Austria, elected King of the Romans, hesitated to accept the dignity. The Hungarians insisted that he had been raised to the throne of Hungary on the express condition that he should not be promoted to the Empire. Bartolomeo, Bishop of Novara, the ambassador of Philip Duke of Milan to Vienna, persuaded Æneas, either as empowered, or thought to be empowered, by the Council, to accompany him on this important mission. An address, drawn by Æneas, not only A.D. 1438. induced Albert to accept the Imperial Crown, but won over the Hungarians, more than to consent, even to urge their King to this step. The grateful thanks of the Diet were awarded to Æneas. But Æneas took great dislike to Vienna, where he was afterwards to pass so many years: he returned to Basle.

¹ "Quocirca mentita est iniquitas Gabrieli, et perdidit eum Dominus in malitiâ suâ." — Lib. ii. sub init.

He returned at a fearful time. During the sixty days, it has been said, between the deposition of Eugenius IV. and the election of his successor, the plague raged at Basle. Some of the dearest friends of Æneas fell around him. He was himself among the few who had the malady and recovered. He might well ascribe his cure to Divine goodness. Æneas preferred piety to science. There were two famous physicians, one a Parisian of admirable skill without religion, the other a German, ignorant but pious. The nature of a certain powder administered to Æneas (the rest of the mode of cure is fully detailed¹) the pious doctor kept a profound secret. The patient was in a high fever, delirious, and so far gone as to receive extreme unction. A rumor of his death reached Milan; his Provostship was given away; on his recovery he found great difficulty in resuming it. He wrote to his patron the Duke, urging that the fact of his writing was tolerably conclusive proof that he was alive.

Æneas was not without his place of honor in the A.D. 1439. great affair of the election of the new Pope. He might indeed have been an Elector. There were but few Italians in the Conclave. The consent of more was earnestly desired. Æneas was urged to accumulate the minor orders, with the subdiaconate and diaconate, which might qualify him for the suffrage. He was still unwilling to fetter himself with the awful sanctity of Holy Orders. He was first employed in the difficult negotiations as to the appointment of the Electors. He was afterwards one of the two Masters

¹ The bubo was in the left groin, the vein of the left foot therefore was opened. He was not allowed to sleep. He took the powder; cataplasms alternately of green radish and of moist chalk were applied to the sore.

of the Ceremonies. He now describes himself as Canon of Trent. This canonry had been granted to him by the grateful Council, and was held with his Provostship of St. Laurence in Milan. On the ceremonial of the Conclave he is full and minute, as one who took no small pride in the arrangements. To his office was attached the duty of standing at the window to receive from the Vice-Chamberlain the food for the use of the Conclave, and to take care that no letters or other unlawful communications were introduced. No doubt his particular account of the kinds of food, in which the Electors indulged, is faithful and trustworthy. He takes care to inform us of the comical anger of the Archdeacon of Cracow, who was allowed to have his dishes of mutton or lamb, but complained bitterly that he might not have his poultry or game, or perhaps small birds.¹

Æneas hailed the election of Amadeus of Savoy with the utmost satisfaction; he had forgotten the Epicurean life of the hermit which he had witnessed at Ripaille. The intrigues and the parsimony of Amadeus darkened on his knowledge at a later period. The splendid eulogy, which he makes a nameless Elector pronounce, might seem to come from the heart of Æneas, as far as his eloquence ever did proceed from the heart. Pope Eugenius is still the odious and contemptible Gabriel. In a letter to his friend John of Segovia, he describes in rapturous terms the coronation of Felix V., the gravity, majesty, ecclesiastical propriety of his demeanor: "the demeanor of him who had been called of God to the rule of his Universal Church."²

¹ *Aviculas.*

² *Epist. ad Joann. Segoviens. Opera, 61, 3.*

Fifty thousand spectators rejoiced, some wept for joy. The vain Æneas will not be silent as to his own part in this splendid ceremonial, though it bordered on the ludicrous. The Cardinal of Santa Susanna chanted the service ; the responses were given by the advocates and notaries¹ in such a dissonant bray, that the congregation burst into roars of laughter. They were heartily ashamed of themselves. But the next day when the preachers were to make the responses, Æneas, though quite ignorant of music (which requires long study), sung out his part with unblushing courage.² Æneas does not forget the tiara worth 30,000 pieces of gold, the processions, the supper or dinner to 1000 guests. He is as full and minute as a herald, manifestly triumphing in the ceremonial as equalling the magnificence, as well as imitating to the smallest point that of Rome.

The Antipope was not ungrateful to his partisan, whose eloquent adulation published his fame and his virtues to still doubtful and vacillating Christendom. Æneas became the secretary of Pope Felix, he was not only his attendant in public, he became necessary to him, and followed him to Ripaille, Thonon, Geneva, Lausanne.

Frederick III. had now succeeded to the Imperial throne. On his adhesion or rejection depended almost entirely the fate of the rival Popes. Who so able, who (might Felix suppose) so true and loyal, who with such consummate address to conduct his cause before the King of the Romans, who so deeply pledged to the justice and holiness of that cause,

¹ Advocati et scrinarii.

² Cantitare meum carmen non erubui.

as his faithful Secretary? Æneas is despatched by Pope Felix to the Imperial Court at Frankfort.

At the Court of Frederick the eloquent and dexterous Italian made a strong impression on Æneas secretary to Frederick III. the counsellors of the young Emperor, Silvester Bishop of Chiemsee, and James Archbishop and Elector of Treves. Frederick was urged to secure the services of a man so experienced in affairs, so gifted, so accomplished. Nothing could be more skilful than the manner in which the Emperor was recommended to secure his attachment. Of all his accomplishments, Æneas was most vain of his poetry. The Emperor appointed him his Laureate;¹ to his letters Æneas for some time prefixed the proud title of Poet. He says, that he did this to teach the dull Viennese, who thought poetry something mischievous and abominable, to treat it with respect.²

Yet he made some decent resistance; he must return to Basle and obtain his free discharge from Felix. He wrung with difficulty, and only by the intervention of his friends, the reluctant assent of the Antipope. On the arrival of the Emperor at Basle, he was named Imperial Secretary, and took the Nov. 1442. oaths of fidelity to Frederick III.; he accompanied his new Lord to Vienna. Æneas saw the turning-point of his fortunes, and never was man so deliberately determined to push forward those fortunes. "You know," he writes to a friend not long after his advancement, "that I serve a Prince who is of neither party, and who by holding a middle course seeks to enforce unity. The Servant must have no will but

¹ The diploma of poet, dated July 27, 1442.

² Epist. c.

that of his Master.”¹ Æneas hopes to obtain a place for his friend at Vienna. “How this may be I know not. In the mean time I shall insinuate myself into the King’s graces: his will shall be mine, I will oppose him in nothing. I am stranger. I shall act the part of Gnatho: what they affirm, I affirm; what they deny, I deny.”² Let those that are wise have their fame, let those that are fools bear their own disgrace; I shall not trouble myself about their honor or their discredit. I shall write, as Secretary, what I am ordered, and no more. I shall hold my tongue and obey: if I should do otherwise, it would not be for my interest, and my interest, you will allow, should be my first object.” It will soon appear how much stronger was the will of the subtle Italian than that of the feeble and irresolute Emperor.

Æneas was for a time not unfaithful to the Council. Already indeed, before he left Basle, he had made the somewhat tardy discovery that their affairs were not altogether governed by the Holy Ghost, but by human passions. He began to think neither party absolutely in the right. He was gently, but rapidly veering to the middle course, then held by his master the Emperor. Yet he treated the arguments of John Carovia, orator of Pope Eugenius, with sufficient disdain. “You say that the Pope has made more ample concessions to the Princes of Germany, and has humbled himself more than was ever heard of Roman Pon-

¹ There is something curious in his observation about the Archbishop of Palermo, who was laboring hard at Frankfort about his writings. “*Stultus est qui putat libellis et codicibus movere reges.*” Æneas is learning to know more of kings.

² *Ego peregrinus sum: consultum mihi est Gnathonis offensum (officium?) suscipere, aiunt aio, negant nego.* Epist. xlv. p. 581.

tiff. This stuff may pass with peasants and those who are utterly ignorant of history." God alone, Æneas still asserts, is superior to a General Council. "You and your party desire unity; that is, on your own terms; if your Pope remain Supreme Pontiff." He more than hints the abdication of Eugenius. "He deserves greatest praise not who clings to his dignity, but who is ready to lay it down. Of old holy men were with greater difficulty prevailed on to be elevated to the Popedom than they are now removed from it. A good disposition and a gentle spirit would not seek in what manner—but how speedily, he might resign."¹ "In truth," he adds, "the quarrel is not for the sheep but for the wool; there would be less strife were the Church poor."

Æneas at first, notwithstanding his prudential determinations, was an object of much jealousy at the Court of the Emperor. William Taz, a Bavarian, was acting as Imperial Chancellor, in the absence of Gaspar Schlick, who had filled that high office under three Emperors, Sigismund, Albert, and Frederick. The Bavarian hated Italians; he thwarted Æneas in every way. The Secretary bore all in patience.² Better times came with the return of Gaspar Schlick to the Court. At Sienna Gaspar had received some civilities, and made friendship with certain kinsmen of the Piccolomini. The enemy of Æneas, William Taz, who had trampled on the Secretary, began humbly to truckle to him. Taz, however, soon left the Court. His other adversaries, as he rose in favor with the Em-

¹ Epist. xxv.

² *Auriculas declinavi, ut iniquæ mentis asellus*: so Æneas writes of himself.

peror; became his humble servants. He was one of the four distinguished persons appointed to hear at Nuremberg the debate before the Diet.

Æneas, his young blood no longer remonstrating against his committing himself to Holy Orders, now entered into the priesthood. His orders of subdeacon, deacon, priest, followed rapidly on each other. He had ceased to dread the sacred office. He no longer desired to indulge the levity of a layman; his whole delight was henceforth to be in his holy calling.¹ He was not long without reward for this decided step. His first benefice, obtained through the emperor's interest, was a singular one for an Italian born in sunny Sienna, and whose life had been passed in journeys, councils, and courts. It was the parochial cure of a retired valley in the Tyrol. It was worth sixty gold pieces a year. It was accessible only up one wild glen, covered with snow and ice three parts of the year. The peasants during the long winter were confined to their cottages, made boxes and other carpenter's work (like the Swiss of Meyringen and elsewhere), which they sold at Trent and Botzen. They passed much time in playing at chess and dice, in which they were wonderfully skilful. They were a simple people, knew nothing of war or glory or gold. Cattle was their only wealth, which they fed with hay in the winter. Some of them had never tasted any liquor but milk. Some lived a great way from the church: if

¹ Jam ego subdiaconus sum, quod olim valde horrebam. Sed recessit a me illa animi levitas, quæ inter laicos crescere solebat. Jamque nihil magis amo quam sacerdotium. Epist. xciii. This letter is in unfortunate juxtaposition with the one (Epist. xcii.) in which he gives so much good advice to his friend, makes such full confession of his own former frailties with the resolution to abandon Venus for Bacchus. See above.

they died their bodies were laid out and became frozen. In the spring the curate went round, collected them into one procession, and buried them altogether in the church-yard. There was not much sorrow at their funerals. Æneas does not flatter the morality of his parishioners (he did not do much to correct it). They would have been the happiest of mankind had they known their blessings and imposed restraint on their lusts. As it was, huddled together night and day in their cottages, they lived in promiscuous concubinage: a virgin bride was unknown. Æneas had some difficulty (every one seems to have had difficulty where the rights of patrons were in perpetual conflict, and the Pope and the Council claimed everything) in obtaining possession of his benefice. Small as was its income, with his canonry it furnished a modest competency, two hundred ducats a year, with which he was fully content. He was anxious to retire from the turbulent world; to secure, as he had passed the meridian of life, a peaceful retreat where he might serve God.¹ We read in the next sentence in his Commentaries that he had given up his happy valley for a better benefice in Bavaria, that of Santa Maria of Auspac, not far from the Inn, which was given him by the Bishop of Passau.

As yet we do not see (when shall we see?) much indulgence of this unworldly disposition: in this respect it is impossible to deny the rigid self-denial of Æneas. In a letter to Gaspar Schlick, the Chancellor, the Italian opens his whole mind. He does not attempt to conceal his own falsehood; he justifies it as of necessity. "Where all are false we must be false too; we

¹ Vellem aliquando me sequestrare ab hujus mundi turbinibus, Deoque servire et mihi vivere. Epist. liv. It was the Sarontana vallis?

must take men as they are." He adduces as authority for this insincerity (I hardly venture to record this) what he dares to call a departure from truth in Him that was all truth.¹ This letter embraces the whole comprehensive and complicated range of Imperial politics, Austria, Bohemia, Hungary. In the great question Æneas has become a stern neutralist. The plan proposed by Charles of France, at the close of 1443, to compel the Council and the Pope to union, now appears the wisest as well as the most feasible measure. "Let the temporal Sovereigns hold their Congress, even against the will of the Clergy, union will ensue. He will be the undoubted Pope, to whom all the Sovereigns render obedience. I see none of the Clergy who will suffer martyrdom in either cause. We have all the same faith with our rulers; if they worshipped idols we should likewise worship them. If the secular power should urge it, we should deny not only the Pope but Christ himself. Charity is cold, faith is dead: we all long for peace: whether through another Council or a Congress of Princes I care not."²

In the Diet of Nuremberg nothing was done in the A.D. 1444. momentous affair. Germany and Frederick III. maintained their cold neutrality. Æneas had sunk to absolute indifference. Another letter to the Pope's Orator Carvajal is in a lighter tone: "You and I may discuss such matters, not as angry theologians, but as calm philosophers. I am content to leave such things to divines, and to think as other people think." He

¹ Sed fingendum est, postquam omnes fingunt. Nam et Jesus finxit se longius ire. Ut homines sunt ita utamur. Æneas should have stuck to his Terence. — liv. p. 539.

² Epist. liv.

does not speak with much respect of the Diet. "What has it done? — it has summoned another. You know my saying: 'No Diet is barren: this will be Oct. 1444. as prolific as the rest: it has another in its womb.'"¹

But the tide now turned. Alfonso II., King of Aragon, his most obstinate and dangerous enemy, made peace with Eugenius. Philippo Maria, Duke of Milan, made peace with Eugenius: all Italy acknowledged Eugenius. The Italian Æneas had no notion of condemning himself to perpetual, if honorable, exile in cold, rude Germany. The churchman would not sever Christendom from Rome, or allow an Ultramontane Papacy to proclaim its independence, if not its superiority. Yet beyond the Alps to less keen eyes never might the cause of Eugenius appear more desperate. The Council, in its proclamations at least, maintained its inflexible resolution. Writings were promulgated throughout Germany, among others a strong manifesto from the University of Erfurt, calling on the German nation to throw off its inglorious neutrality, and at once to espouse the cause of religious freedom and the Council of Basle. The violent act of Eugenius in threatening to depose the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves had awakened the fears and the resentment of many among the haughty Prelates of Germany, and had excited high indignation in the German mind. But Æneas knew his own strength, and the weakness of the Emperor. Frederick determined, or rather imagined that he acted on his own determination, to enter into negotiations. And now again who so fit to conduct those negotiations as his faithful Secretary? who but an

Change in
favor of
Eugenius.

A.D. 1445.
Bull of actual
deposition.
Feb. 9, 1446.

¹ Epist. lxxii. Compare Æneas Sylvius (Fea), p. 84.

Italian, so intimately acquainted with the interests of Germany, so attached to the Emperor, so able, so eloquent, could cope with the Prelates and Cardinals of Rome? ¹ Æneas was more true to his Imperial than he had been to his Papal patron; being true to the Emperor he was true to himself.

Æneas arrived at his native Sienna. His kindred, proud no doubt of his position, crowded round him. They entreated him not to venture to Rome. Eugenius was cruel, unforgetful of injuries, bound by neither pity nor conscience.² A man so deeply committed in the affairs of the hostile Council might expect the worst. Æneas boldly answered that the ambassador of the Emperor of Germany must be safe everywhere. He did not betray a more important secret, that already he had obtained through two friendly Cardinals, Carvajal and Landriano, pardon for all that he had done at Basle.

He entered Rome: he was admitted to the presence of the Pope, beside whom stood the two friendly Cardinals. He was permitted to kiss the foot, the cheek of the Pontiff. His credentials were in his hand. He was commanded to declare the object of his mission. "Ere I fulfil the orders of the Emperor, allow me, most holy Pontiff, a few words on myself. I know that many things have been brought to the ears of your Holiness concerning me, things not to my credit, and on which it were better not to dwell: neither have my accusers spoken falsely. At Basle I have written much,

¹ To this visit to Rome belong the observations he makes in a letter to his patron the Bishop of Passau. Epist. xcvi. The Cardinals, he says, are by no means so rich as of old.

² Aiebant Eugenium crudelem, injuriarum memorem, nullâ pietate, nullâ conscientiâ teneri. — Apud Fea, p. 88.

spoken much, done much ; but my design was not to injure you, I sought only the advantage of the Catholic Church. I have erred, who will deny it, but with neither few nor undistinguished men : Julian, the Cardinal of St. Angelo, the Archbishop of Palermo, Pontanus the Prothonotary of your Court, men esteemed in the eyes of the law, masters of all truth. I speak not of the Universities and Schools throughout the world, almost all adverse to your cause. With such authorities who had not erred ? I must confess, that so soon as I detected the errors of those at Basle, I did not, as most others did, fly to you. But fearing to fall from error to error, from Scylla to Charybdis, I would not, without consultation and delay, rush from one extreme to the other. I sided with those called neutrals. I remained three years with the Emperor, heard the discussions between your Legates and those of Basle, nor could longer doubt that the truth was on your side ; not unwillingly therefore I accepted this embassy from the Emperor, hoping thereby, through your clemency, to be restored to your favor. I am in your hands : I have sinned in ignorance, I implore pardon. And now to the affairs of the Emperor.”¹ The Pope, no doubt well prepared for this address, had his answer ready. The Ambassador of the Emperor, a man of the ability and importance of Æneas, was not to be repelled even by the stubborn Eugenius. “ We know that you have erred, with many others ; we cannot deny pardon to one who confesses his errors. Our holy Mother, the Church, withholds mercy from those only who refuse to acknowledge their sins. You are now in possession of

¹ Commentar. Nov. p. 11.

the truth, look that you do not abandon it. Show forth the divine grace in your good works. You are in a position to defend the truth, to do good service to the Church. We shall forget all the wrongs committed against us; him that walketh uprightly we shall love!" Of the Cardinals, only the virtuous Thomas of Sarzana, afterwards Nicolas V., looked coldly on the renegade, and Æneas as haughtily refused to humiliate himself. "O ignorance of man," writes Æneas, "had I known that he would be Pope, what would I not have borne!"¹ But Æneas fell ill, and Thomas of Sarzana sent a common friend to console him, and to offer aid for the payment of his physicians. John Carvajal, the Pope's Legate in Germany, visited him every day. He recovered, returned to Sienna, saw his father for the last time, and went back to Germany. He was followed by a message from the Pope, appointing him his Secretary, "Wonderful and unparalleled grace of God" (so writes his biographer, probably Æneas himself) "that one man should be Secretary to two Popes" (he was continued in the office by Nicolas V.), "to an Emperor and an Antipope."² Æneas humbly ascribes the glory to God, as if his own craft and tergiversations had no share in the marvel.

Germany began slowly to feel and to betray the influence of the wily Italian. He ruled the irresolute

¹ Si scisset Æneas futurum Papam, omnia tolerâset. Fea, p. 89.

² So too in Epist. clxxxviii. p. 760. Apud tres Episcopos et totidem Cardinales dictandarum Epistolarum officium exercui. Hi tres quoque Pontifices maximi secretariorum collegio me ascripserunt, Eugenius, Nicolaus, Felix, quamvis hunc adulterum dixerit. Apud Cæsarem non secretarius modo, sed consiliarius et principatus honore auctus sum. Neque ego ista fortunæ imputo, quamvis nescio causam, sed ipsius rectori et dominatori omnium Deo. Thus writes Æneas in his own person.

Emperor.¹ Yet even now affairs looked only more menacing and dangerous to Pope Eugenius. After due deliberation he had peremptorily refused the Emperor's demand to convoke another Council in Germany. Not only were the two Archbishop Electors under sentence of deposition, new Electors² had been named on his sole authority; not even Germans, but near relatives of the powerful Philip of Burgundy, sworn to place them on their thrones. Six of the Electors entered into a solemn League, that ^{Frankfort, March 21. A.D. 1448.} if Eugenius did not immediately annul his bull of deposal against the Archbishops, limit the ecclesiastical burdens on the Empire, and submit to the decree of Constance, which asserted the supremacy of General Councils, they would cast aside their long neutrality, and either summon a new Council or acknowledge the Council of Basle and Pope Felix V.³ They sent an embassy to communicate this secret covenant to the Emperor and to six only of his Privy Councillors, and to demand his adhesion to the League. The Emperor admitted the justice of their demands as to the rehabilitation of the deposed Prelates, but refused to join the League, "it was impious to compel the Pope to terms by threatening to revolt from his authority."⁴ The Emperor, not sworn to secrecy, confided the whole to Æneas, by him at his discretion to be communicated to Rome. Æneas was ordered

¹ There were negotiations, perhaps a private treaty, between King Frederick and Eugene. Carvajal was at Vienna. — Voigt, c. 6.

² They were Bishop John of Cambray, Philip's natural brother, to Treves; to Cologne, Prince Adolph of Cleves, his sister's son. Schmidt, vii. 18, p. 338.

³ Apud Guden. iv. 290; Schmidt, p. 339.

⁴ There is some slight discrepancy here between the Commentaries and the history.

again to Rome to persuade the Pope to cede the restitution of the Archbishops.

He went round it seems by Frankfort, where the Electors held or were about to hold their diet. At Frankfort he found, perhaps it was his object there, the Papal Legates, Thomas of Sarzana (Bishop of Bologna), and John Carvajal. They were in dire perplexity. One must hasten to Rome for further instructions, Carvajal was ill, Æneas set off in the company of Thomas of Sarzana. It was spring, the bridges were broken down. They crossed the Alps in three days by paths only known to mountain guides over precipices and glaciers.

At Rome the Pope took the counsel of Thomas of Sarzana. Before he admitted the Ambassadors of the Electors, he had a private interview with Æneas Sylvius. Æneas at his last visit had brought himself, he now brought the Emperor to the feet of Eugenius. The only concession urged on the Pope was the revocation of the fatal step, and the restoration of the deposed Electors. The Emperor could not endure French Electors. For once the obstinate Eugenius bowed himself to the wiser yielding policy; Æneas had imparted his own pliancy to the Pope. There was but one difficulty, how to appease Philip Duke of Burgundy, who might resent the dismissal of his kindred, his nephew and natural brother, the intruded Archbishops of Cologne and Treves. The Papalists had tempted, flattered, bribed the pride and ambition of one of the proudest and most ambitious of men; they must allay that pride and ambition. Thomas of Sarzana was intrusted with this delicate mission: Æneas was to return to Germany, to manage the

Emperor and the Empire. The Pope then admitted the Ambassadors of the six Electors. At the head of these was Gregory of Heimbург, a bold, free-spoken, fearless man, the most learned lawyer in the Empire, but described by Sylvius as of coarse manners; a genuine German of his age unfavorably contrasted in his own judgment with the supple Siennese. Heimbург's address to the Pope was intrepid, haughty: "Germany was united; it was embittered by the deposition of the Bishops — the Princes were resolved to assert the authority of General Councils." The Pope's answer was cold and brief. He had deposed the Archbishops for good reasons: he had never shown disrespect to Councils, but had maintained the dignity of the Apostolic See. He would prepare a written reply. He detained them in Rome in sullen indignation at their delay in the hot ungenial city.¹

Æneas set forth on his return with Thomas of Sarzana. They travelled together, though Æneas was suffering from the stone, by Sienna, Pistoia, Lucca. Æneas entered Florence, the Bishop of Bologna was not allowed to do so. Æneas was obliged to leave the Bishop ill at Parma. He hastened by Mantua,

¹ Hic orationem arrogantis plenam habuit; dixit Germanis principes unitos esse eadem velle et sapere, depositionem Episcoporum amarulento tulisse animo, petere ut cassetur annulleturque, ut auctoritas conciliorum approbetur, ut nationi opportunè concedatur. . . . Eugenius ad hæc eue more pauca et graviter respondit. Hist. Freder. III. apud Kollar. p. 123. See the curious account of Gregory's behavior. Interea legati Electorum affecti tædio murmurabant, neque sine timorè fuerunt quod nimis rigidè se locutos sentiebant. Gregorius juxta Montem Jordunum post vespas deambulare, caloribus exæstuans, quasi et Romanos et officium suum contemneret, dimissis in terram caligis, aperto pectore, nudo capite, brachia disoperiens, fastibundus incedebat, Romanosque et Eugenium et Curiam blasphemabat, multaque in calores terræ ingerebat mala. Est enim aër Romanus Theutonicis infestissimus . . . quia plus sanguinis habent quam Italici, et plus merum ebibunt, plus calore cruciantur. Ibid. 124.

Verona, Trent, Memmingen, Ulm.¹ At Ulm he was stopped by fear of robbers, who infested the whole road to Frankfort. He fell in with the Bishops of Augsburg and Chiemsee, and the Chancellor Gaspar ; with them he reached Frankfort in safety.

At Frankfort the Diet had met in imposing fulness.
Sept. 1, 1446.
Diet at
Frankfort. The Emperor was represented by the Chancellor, the Bishops of Augsburg and Chiemsee, the Marquises of Baden and Brandenburg, and by Æneas Sylvius. The Electors were all present. The Pope's Legates were John de Carvajal and Nicolas de Cusa. Thomas of Sarzana did not arrive till he had successfully fulfilled his mission to the Duke of Burgundy. Louis, Cardinal of Arles, John de Lysura and others appeared for the Council of Basle and the Antipope. Louis of Arles claimed to have the cross borne before him, and to celebrate the first mass before the Diet as Papal Legate. His claim was supported by the Electors, fully determined to maintain the rights of the Council. The Emperor's Ambassadors remonstrated ; Germany was yet pledged to strict neutrality. The citizens of Frankfort were on that side ; they had sworn allegiance to the Emperor, not to the Electors ; the Cardinal of Arles was forced ungraciously to submit.

The session was opened by Gregory of Heimburg, Altercation. who reported the reception of his mission at Rome. He described the Court of Rome as implacably hostile to Germany ; Eugenius as harsh, haughty, repulsive. The Cardinals he turned into ridicule, especially "the bearded old goat," the Cardinal Bessarion. Æneas replied, rebuking the unfairness of the

¹ Comment. 94. Compared with other documents.

German, and laboring to bring out the milder and more courteous points in the demeanor and language of the Pope. Æneas had to encounter some unpleasant altercation. The Cardinal of Arles reproached him with his tergiversations. "It is not I," answered Æneas, "who have changed, but the Council; they once offered to remove the Council from Basle, now they refuse; as if all truth were contained within the walls of Basle." John de Lysura was even more pointed and personal. "Are you come from Sienna to legislate for Germany? You had better have stayed at home and left us to settle our own affairs." Æneas kept prudent silence.

The reports from Rome had made a deep and unfavorable impression. Basle appeared to triumph; the Electors seemed determined to declare for the Council and for Felix V. But the resources of Æneas were not exhausted; he boldly summoned to his aid two irresistible allies—in plain language, bribery, and forgery. All things, Æneas had said in his Antipapal days, are venal with the Court of Rome; the imposition of hands, the gifts of the Holy Ghost are openly sold.¹ Rome could buy as well as sell; and the severe virtue of Germany was not proof against pontifical gold. No less a person than the Archbishop of Mentz sold himself to Eugenius: meaner men could not hesitate with such an example. The Archbishop did not actually take the money with his own hands, but two thousand Rhenish florins were distributed among his four chief Counsellors.²

¹ Nihil est quod absque argento Romana Curia dedit. Nam et ipsæ manus impositiones, et Spiritûs Sancti dona venundantur. Epist. lxvi.

² Cumque res diu inutiliter tractaretur, ad pecuniam tandem recurrere oportet, cui rarè non obaudiunt aures, hæc domina curiarum est, hæc aures

But the Archbishop Elector would maintain decency. He could not veer round without some specious excuse. Æneas boldly took in hand the Ambassadors' instructions; he dressed them up, quietly discarding every hard or offensive word, insinuating milder and more conciliatory expressions; and with deliberate effrontery presented these notes, as authorized by Pope Eugenius.¹ He ran the risk of being disclaimed by the stubborn Pontiff, and exposed as the Forger of official documents. The notes declared the assent of the Pope to the restoration of the deposed Archbishops, vaguely recognized the independence of the German nation, saved the authority of General Councils. Æneas had calculated with his usual sagacity. These notes were accepted, and presented to the Diet, signed by the Elector of Mentz, the Marquis of Brandenburg, the Grand Master of Prussia, the Archbishops of Salzburg and Magdeburg, and many other Princes. The Elector of Treves and the Duke of Saxony alone opposed; the Elector Palatine wavered. The Electoral League was paralyzed, a new League formed between the Emperor, the Electors of Mentz, Brandenburg, and the rest. The Diet broke up, the three Electors departed in indignation; the Ambassadors of Basle in sorrow and discomfiture.

omnium aperit: huic omnia serviunt: hæc quoque *Moguntinum expugnavit*. These are the words of Æneas Sylvius himself in his *Hist. Frederic. III.* published by Kollar, vol. ii. p. 127. The Emperor advanced the money; it was afterwards paid by Nicolas V. Compare also Fea, p. 100.

¹ Cum Legati Cæsaris non possent menti Pontificis satisfacere, Æneas modum commentus est, qui, receptis notulis, secundum quas se Principes obligaverant, nisi Eugenius illas admitteret velle se eum deserere, omne venenum ex eis ademit, *novasque notulas composuit*, per quas et Archiepiscopi deprivati restituerentur, et nationi opportunè provideretur et auctoritas Conciliorum salvaretur, illasque dixit sua opinione Eugenium non negaturum. — Vit. Fred. III. p. 129.

Æneas and Procopius Rabensteyn, a Bohemian Noble, were despatched to Rome as Imperial Ambassadors to obtain the Pope's assent to the terms thus framed. On his assent the Emperor and most of the German Princes would forswear their neutrality and acknowledge him for Pope. Letters had been previously sent; the College of Cardinals was divided; the more rigid theologians would admit no concession. Pope Eugenius was advised to create four new Cardinals, the Archbishop of Milan, the Abbot of St. Paul, Thomas of Sarzana Bishop of Bologna, John Carvajal. At Sienna the Imperial Ambassadors encountered others from the Archbishop of Mentz and the German Princes. The representative of Mentz was no less than John of Lysura, but a few days before so stern a Basilian, who had been so offended by the apostasy of Æneas, and had now trimmed his sails to the wind.

They were received with joyous welcome as bringing the submission of Germany to the Papal See.¹ The third day they were introduced into the private consistory. Æneas spoke; all heard with rapture. No voice was silent in his praise! That very day the Pope was seized with mortal sickness. The physicians said that he could not live ten days. Would he live long enough to ratify the Treaty? The Ambassadors were only commissioned to Eugenius: delay might be fatal, a new schism might arise. "If" (said John of Lysura) "the little toe of his left foot is alive, it is enough." The Pope not only lived to issue the Apostolic Bulls, but to reward the invaluable services of Æneas Sylvius. A vacancy in the Bishopric of Trieste was announced,

¹ *Erat enim ingens gaudium prope sexdecim annos Germaniam perditam recuperasse.* Fea, p. 105.

the Pope at once appointed Æneas to the See. The
 Feb. 28, rejoicings at Rome were like those at a great
 1447. victory, bonfires blazed, the city was illumi-
 nated, the noise of trumpets, the pealing of bells rang
 through the streets. After fourteen days died Pope
 Eugenius ; his stubborn pertinacity might seem to have
 won a glorious triumph : he had deluded the Germans
 by some specious concessions, of which he himself well
 knew the hollow value (the Apostolic Bulls were called
 Concordats) ; he had almost reconquered the allegiance
 of Christendom. But he is said to have exclaimed on
 his death-bed, “ Oh Gabriel, better had it been for your
 soul, if you had never been Cardinal, never Pope, but
 continued to practise the religious discipline of your
 monastery ! ”¹ The Pope was dead, the Monk still
 lived.

¹ *Palatii Gesta Pontificum apud Weissenberg*, p. 465. The character of Eugenius changes in the writings of Æneas with the changes in Æneas himself. We have seen some illustrations of this. In the *Hist. Concil. Basil.* “ Eugenius is a reed shaken by the wind ” (no very apt similitude), an object of dislike, even of contempt. In his *Dialogue de Auctor. Concilii*, alluded to in his *Retractation*, his praise of Felix passes into adulation. There is no grace or virtue which is not heaped upon him. In Eugenius the defiance darkens into vituperation: “ Vexator ecclesiæ; non solum laude indignus, sed detestatione et execratione totius humani generis dignus proculdubio est.” So says one of the interlocutors, unrebuked by Æneas. Compare on the other side the high character of the *de Europâ*, p. 458. So too in *Vit. Frederic. III.* p. 135. *Fuit autem Eugenius alti animi, injuriarum tenax, delatoribus aurem præbuit, avaritiam calcavit, honoris cupidus fuit: ubi sententiam imbuit, non facile mutari potuit: religiosis viris admodum favit.* In another passage — *alti cordis fuit, sed nullum in eo vitium fuit, nisi quia sine mensurâ erat, et non quod potuit, sed quod voluit, aggressus est.* This heightens our opinion of the boldness and sagacity of Æneas in persuading such a man to accept as his own, instructions which he had not given.

CHAPTER XVII.

NICOLAS V.

THE Pontificate of Nicolas V. is the culminating point of Latin Christianity. The Papal power indeed had long reached its zenith. From Innocent III. to Boniface VIII. it had begun its decline. But Latin Christianity was alike the religion of the Popes and of the Councils which contested their supremacy. It was as yet no more than a sacerdotal strife whether the Pope should maintain an irresponsible autocracy, or be limited and controlled by an ubiquitous aristocratic Senate. The most ardent reformers looked no further than to strengthen the Hierarchy. The Prelates were determined to emancipate themselves from the usurpations of the Pope, as to their elections, their arbitrary taxation by Rome, the undermining of their authority by perpetual appeals; but they had no notion of relaxing in the least the ecclesiastical domination. It was not that Christendom might govern itself, but that themselves might have a more equal share in the government. They were as jealously attached as the Pope to the creed of Latin Christianity. The Council, not the Pope, burned John Huss. Their concessions to the Bohemians were extorted from their fears, not granted by their liberality. Gerson, D'Ailly, Louis of Arles, Thomas of Corcelles, were as rigid theologians as Mar-

tin V. or Eugenius IV. The Vulgate was their Bible, the Latin service their exclusive liturgy, the Canon Law their code of jurisprudence.

Latin Christianity had yet to discharge some part of its mission. It had to enlighten the world with letters, to adorn it with arts. It had hospitably to receive (a gift fatal in the end to its own dominion) and to promulgate to mankind the poets, historians, philosophers of Greece. It had to break down its own idols, the Schoolmen, and substitute a new idolatry, that of Classical Literature. It had to perfect Christian art. Already Christian Architecture had achieved some of its wonders. The venerable Lateran and St. Paul's without the Walls, the old St. Peter's, St. Mark's at Venice and Pisa, Strasburg and Cologne, Rheims and Bourges, York and Lincoln, stood in their majesty. Christian Painting, and even Christian Sculpture, were to rise to their untranscended excellence.

The choice of Nicolas V. was one of such singular
Nicolas V.
March 6,
1447. felicity for his time that it cannot be wondered if his admirers looked on it as overruled by the Holy Spirit. "Who would have thought in Florence," so said Nicolas to his biographer Vespasiano, "that a priest who rang the bells should become Supreme Pontiff?"¹ Yet it seems to have been a happy accident. Eighteen Cardinals met in the Conclave. Ten voices were for the Cardinal Colonna; two more would give him the requisite majority. Alfonso, King of Arragon and Sicily, encamped at Tivoli, favored the Colonna. Already, to end the strife, the Cardinal of Bologna had risen to add his suffrage. He was checked and interrupted by the wise Cardinal of

¹ Apud Muratori, p. 279.

Tarento. "Whom, then," said he, "do you nominate?" "The Cardinal of Bologna!" A sudden light seemed to flash on the Conclave: Thomas of Sarzana, Cardinal of Bologna, was Pope.¹

Had a turbulent, punctilious, obstinate Pope, another Eugenius, succeeded Eugenius IV., all might again have been strife and confusion. The consummate diplomatic skill of Æneas Sylvius had extorted some concessions on his death-bed even from that impracticable Pope. Some questions had been designedly left in decent vagueness.

The Cardinal of Bologna was forty-eight years old. His rise to honors had been rapid — Bishop, Cardinal, Pope, in three successive years.² He was known as a lover and liberal patron of letters. As Legate he had been singularly active, conciliatory, popular, and therefore successful. He had seemingly personal friendship for Æneas Sylvius, and could fully appreciate his wise and dexterous management. He left the German negotiations in those able hands; but a speech attributed to him was well-timed. "The Bishops had too little, rather than too much power: he had no design to encroach on their lawful authority."³ This is more remarkable, as in all business he had the most perfect self-confidence: nothing was well done which he did not do himself.⁴

¹ Vit. Nicolai V., a Dominico Georgio, p. 4.

² 1445, 1446, 1447.

³ Weissenberg.

⁴ See the elaborate character of Nicolas V. by Æneas Sylvius, — Fea, p. 139. He was hasty but placable; friendly, but there was no friend with whom he was not at some time angry. "*Nimium de se credidit, omnia per se facere voluit. Nihil bene fieri putavit, nisi interesset. Injuriarum neque ultor, neque oblitus est*"

Two years had hardly elapsed when Nicolas V. (so well had Æneas Sylvius done his work in Germany) was sole and undisputed Pope. The Council of Basle, disowned, almost forgotten, had dissolved itself. Felix V. was again Amadeus of Savoy, in his peaceful retreat at Ripaille. The Council had the wisdom to yield, the Pope the greater wisdom to admit the Council to an honorable capitulation. The Fathers at Basle appeared to submit to the friendly urgency of the Kings of France and England. They maintained prudent silence on the abandonment of their cause by the Emperor Frederick III. and his as yet ambiguous and disguised menaces of compulsory dissolution. The Prince-Pope was permitted to retire, not without dignity. Nicolas demanded not that insulting humiliation which had been enforced by his predecessors on their discomfited rivals. Felix V. sunk into a Cardinalate, and that Cardinalate next in honor to the Pope. Louis of Arles was restored to his rank. Three out of the Cardinals named by Felix were advanced by Nicolas; the rest were dead or content to abdicate. All the Papal censures against the Pope and the Council were annulled; the Acts of the Council, as far as promotions and appointments, confirmed.

Dissolution
of Council
of Basle.
A.D. 1449.

Abdication
of Felix.

So ended the last Antipope,¹ so closed the last Council which claimed coequal authority with the Pope. The peaceful treaty showed a great advance in Christian courtesy, in Christian forbearance, in the majesty of Christian gentleness; but some decay too in the depth and ardor of Christian zeal. To have been an Antipope was no longer an odious and inextinguishable crime —

¹ Amadeus lived only to Jan. 1, 1451. Muratori, sub ann. 1449.

a crime to be forgiven only after the most contumelious abasement, or as an ostentatious act of mercy. Felix may have owed something to his princely rank, more to the times and to the sagacious character of Nicolas V. Basle saw the last Council which could pretend to the title of Œcumenic: that of Trent was a Council of Papal Christendom, and by no means the whole of Papal Christendom. All that had severed itself from Latin Christianity, part which was still in union, stood aloof from an assembly chiefly gathered from two nations, Spain and Italy.

Nicolas V. retired into his serene and peaceful dignity: not so his restless colleague in all his negotiations and in his journeys. Æneas Syl-^{Æneas Sylvius.} vius had still years of busy life before him. Among the first acts of Pope Nicolas had been the confirmation of Æneas in his Papal Secretaryship and in his Bishopric of Trieste. It was singular enough that, as Bishop of Bologna, Thomas of Sarzana had been honored everywhere but in his own See. Bologna would not admit him within her walls. The Church of Trieste, at first refractory, could not but receive a Bishop commended by the Emperor and the Pope.

The Bishop of Trieste returned to Germany. No affair of Frederick III. could be conducted without his aid. He was first sent to the Diet of Aschaf- July 12, 1447. senburg, which, under the Archbishop of Mentz, accepted the Bulls of Pope Eugenius and acknowledged Pope Nicolas. Duke Philippo Maria, the last of the Viscontis, died,¹ Milan was in confusion.² The Em-

¹ In the castle of Porta Zobbia, Aug. 15, 1447.

² "Incredibile allora fu la rivoluzione dello Stato de Milano; tutto ai sompi di sedizioni, ed ognuno prese l' armi." — Muratori, sub ann.

peror, among the competitors for the Dukedom,¹ as an escheated fief of the Empire, would beyond that, put in his claim as actual Ruler. Æneas was among his ambassadors. Milan would own the suzerainty of the Emperor, but at the same time maintain her freedom. The Embassy returned, having effected nothing, from the impracticable city.² Æneas attributes their failure to the grasping ambition of his German colleagues in the Embassy: demanding too much, they lost all; his more subtle policy would have succeeded better. He returned to Vienna, was consecrated Bishop of Trieste, visited his diocese, was received with cordial welcome, and celebrated mass. But he was not long occupied with his peaceful duties. He was called upon to settle a question of frontier in Istria between the Emperor and the Venetians. On his return to Trieste he found a Count Rupert warring on the city, wasting the estates of the Church. He laid his complaints before the Emperor, but himself hardly escaped from the hands of the noble freebooter. On his return to Vienna he found his power in the Council somewhat in danger. His friend and patron Gaspar Schlick was in disgrace. He died July 16, 1449. As of the Chancellor's faction Æneas fell under suspicion. With his usual dexterity he steered his course, not absolutely renouncing his friend, yet not offending the Emperor. He received another benefice, a rich parish church in the neighborhood of Vienna.

Milan again besieged by Francis Sforza made over-

¹ Charles, Duke of Orleans, in right of his mother, Valentina, sister of the late Duke; Alfonso, King of Naples and Arragon, by the will of the late Duke; Francis Sforza, husband of the natural daughter of the late Duke.

² Commentar. Pii II., &c., pp. 19, 25.

tures to the Emperor. Again the indefatigable Æneas crossed the Worm Alp, descended into the July, 1449. Valteline, and found the Lake of Como and its shores overrun by the troops of Sforza; he reached Como with difficulty. That city was beset on all sides; Sforza eagerly desired to seize the Imperial Ambassadors. At the head of a few soldiers, Æneas dashed through by night and reached Milan.¹ Notwithstanding the open and the secret opposition of Sforza's partisans, he assembled and harangued the people. Three gates (quarters) of the city would have proclaimed the Emperor without condition, one more had been a majority.² Terms were however framed, on the whole favorable to the Emperor, but such as Æneas had no authority to accept. Charles Gonzaga proposed to Æneas to seize the city by force. This Æneas declined as unbecoming his ecclesiastical character. The scheme was full of dangers, and of very doubtful issue! Æneas returned to the Emperor. Frederick, however, needed not only dexterous Ambassadors, but well-^{From Feb. 28 to March 22, 1450.} appointed armies and able Generals to occupy and protect Milan: he had neither. Milan opened her gates to Sforza; Sforza was Duke of Milan.³

In the first year of Sforza's dukedom, that of the Jubilee, Æneas was engaged on a more peaceful mission, to settle the contract of marriage between the Emperor and Leonora, sister of the King of Portugal. The agreement was readily made at Naples with the

¹ Vit. Frederic. III., p. 147.

² Ibid. p. 149.

³ "Qui etiam insignia ducalia, tradente populo, suscepit, quæ res neque vim neque colorem habuit justitiæ." — P. 162. Muratori, sub ann. i. 450. For the personal adventures of Æneas Sylvius, see the Commentaries and Life of Frederick III. apud Kollar, p. 140, et seq.

Ambassadors of Portugal. Æneas saw Rome at the height of the Jubilee, his friend and Patron, Nicolas V., receiving the homage, the well-deserved homage, and the tribute of the world.

In Nicolas V., in three short years, the Pope had become again a great Italian Potentate. Not that Nicolas V. was of one of the famous houses, or aspired to found a family of Princes. He was superior to, or not tempted to that Nepotism, which had already made some advances, some initiatory efforts, to invest the descendants or kinsmen of Popes in territorial honors or titles. Hitherto these families had taken no root, had died out, sunk into obscurity, or had been beaten down by common consent as upstart usurpers. Nicolas V. laid the foundation of his power, not so much in the strength of the Roman See as a temporal Sovereignty, as in the admiration and gratitude of Italy, which was rapidly reported over the whole of Christendom. He kept in pay no large armies, his Cardinals were not Condottieri generals; he declared that he would never employ any arms but those of the Cross of Christ.¹ But he maintained the Estates of the Church in peace, he endeavored (and the circumstances of the times favored that better policy) to compose the feuds of Italy, raging at least with their usual violence. He was among the few Popes, really a great Pacificator in Italy. Four mighty Powers were now mingled in open war, or in secret intrigue. Alfonso, King of Arragon and the two Sicilies, the Dukes of Milan, the Venetians and the Florentines. Eugenius had had the wisdom, or good fortune, to abandon the French pretensions to the throne of Naples, that fatal

¹ Vespasiano, p. 279.

claim by which the Popes had for centuries entailed the miseries of war upon Italy, and servitude upon themselves. The strife for the Dukedom of Milan, notwithstanding the pretensions of the Emperor, and all the arts of Æneas Sylvius, the claims of the King of Arragon, and of the House of Orleans, had terminated in the establishment of the Sforzas. Pope Nicolas almost for the first time entered openly into Italian politics, as a true Mediator — not as a partisan — and, so doing, was for the first time (to a certain extent at least) successful in his mediation. Even in the wars of these powers Romagna was respected and escaped devastation. The warlike chieftains who had usurped the cities and domains of the Church, were glad to become her subjects. The Malatestas accepted the recognition of their title as Lords of Rimini, Fano, and other cities of Romagna, and from their tribute the Pope received a revenue, if not equal in amount, more sure and less invidious than his own taxation. The retrenchments insisted upon by the Council of Basle, were eluded by a Concordat, drawn with all the subtlety of Æneas Sylvius, and received by his obsequious master Frederick. In remote regions there were still deep murmurs at the avarice, the venality of Rome; Nicolas and his Court escaped not, and did not deserve to escape, the common charge of rapacity; but such murmurs died away in those distant quarters, or had lost their effect.¹

¹ Stimmen, p. 115. The ambassador, credited with 1225 ducats, is instructed to give 1000 ducats either in gold or in some rich present — 225 are for the Cardinal patron. But if the Pope is not content with the 1000, he must have it all, and the Protector wait. The close of the affair is even more discreditable to the Pope. It is a very curious detail on the process of Papal bribery. In 1449, a collector and vender of Indulgences levied

All this was not done, but it was well begun before the Jubilee; and no Jubilee had been more splendid, more peaceful, attended by greater numbers,¹ productive of more immense wealth.² A new coin for the Jubilee was struck. From every part of Europe came pilgrims of the highest rank, strangers swarmed like ants in the streets of Rome and Florence. The throng was so great that above 200 persons were crushed to death on the bridge of St. Angelo.³ The Bank of the Medici alone had 100,000 florins belonging to the Church,⁴ and during the whole time poured in riches, which aided in the restoration of the dilapidated finances of the Popedom. The Pilgrims carried back throughout Europe accounts of the resuscitated majesty of the Roman Pontificate, the unsullied personal dignity of the Pope, the reënthronement of religion in the splendid edifices, which were either building or under restoration.⁵

in Prussia 7845 marks: for Indulgences, 3241; for Peter's Pence, 4604. — P. 137.

¹ "Dopo il primo Giubileo del Anno 1300 forse non fu mai venduto un sì gran flusso e riflusso di gente in Roma, de modo che le strade Maestre d' Italia pareano tante Fiere." — Muratori, Ann., sub ann. "Licet quadringenta et amplius millia diebus singulis per urbem templa foraque vaderent." — Vit. Freder. III., p. 172.

² The Teutonic Order tried to suppress the Bull, and to discourage the wasteful journey to Rome. The Pope was furious, and only appeased by a great offering. — Stimmen, p. 140.

³ Infessura, Chron. de Rimini; Æneas Sylvius, Vit. Frederic. p. 172.

⁴ Vespasiano, Vit. Nicol. V.

⁵ The Jubilee was interrupted by the plague, the fear of which had driven many in devotion to Rome (Sanuto says 60,000 died in Milan; hardly a man was left alive in Piacenza). — Muratori. The Cardinals, the Pope himself, were obliged to fly from Rome. "His Holiness goes from one castle to another with a small Court, and very few followers, seeking to find anywhere an uninfected place. His Holiness is now in a castle called Fabriano, where he was last year for some time; and it is said has forbidden, under pain of death, that any one, of any rank whatever, who is

Among those who would disseminate the fame of Nicolas V., none would be more loud, as none had stronger reasons to be grateful, than Æneas Sylvius. He had just reached the Alps on his return from Rome (he had hardly escaped drowning in a swollen stream), when he was overtaken by the pleasant intelligence that he had been named by the Pope, Bishop of his native city of Sienna. Æneas had never contemplated the passing the rest of his life in the cold ungenial region of Germany. "I yearn," he writes, "for my native Italy; I dread nothing so much as to lay my bones in a foreign land, though the way to heaven or to hell lies open alike from both. But it would be less painful, I know not why, to die in the arms of brothers, sisters, sons, grandsons."¹ It should seem² that he turned back, saw the Pope again, entered Sienna, was welcomed with the joyful acclamations of the inhabitants, proud to receive a native Siennese as their Bishop. But the Bishop of Sienna returned to his Imperial Master: Germany must still be held in its close alliance with Rome. His next embassy, in the following year, was into Bohemia. Both on his journey towards Prague and on his return, he was hospitably received in Tabor, the city of the most extreme disciples of John Huss. In a letter to John Carvajal,³ the Cardinal of St. Angelo, he gives a striking description of that inexpugnable fortress. Over the gates were two shields: on one

at Rome, shall come secretly or openly to Fabriano, or within seven miles of it: the Cardinals alone are excepted, who are limited to four servants." — Voigt, from the Despatches of the Teutonic Knights. *Stimmen*, p. 70. This is not a very high view of the Pope's courage.

¹ Epist. lxxv.

² The account is not clear.

³ Epist. cxxx.

was painted an Angel with the Sacramental Cup; on the other the blind old Ziska, their leader in war while alive, whose skin, stretched on a drum, after his death, had inspirited them to certain victory. The Bishop of Sienna had strong misgivings in entering this headquarters of Satan. The Churchman held the audacious sectaries, who disdained the Primacy of Rome (the head of their offending, which included all other heresies), in the devoutest horror. "The Emperor Sigismund, instead of granting terms of peace to this most wicked and sacrilegious race, ought to have exterminated them, or reduced them to hewers of stone for the rest of mankind." Æneas had forgotten the irresistible valor, the splendid years of victory, which had extorted these terms from the Emperor. But the rude, poor Taborites treated the Bishop with perfect courtesy. At a town about twenty-five miles from Prague (a pestilence was raging in Prague, and to his regret he dared not approach that ancient and noble city), he met the heads of the Bohemian nation. The object of his mission was soon despatched; the summons of a general Convention in the following year, with the Ambassador of the Emperor, and the Pope's Legate, at Leutmeritz. In that city he held a long theological discussion with George Podiebrad; a second at Tabor with Nicolas, the Bishop of the sect. He acknowledged that all his eloquence made no impression on the stubborn Utraquists. The Taborites stuck to the Scripture, Æneas to the power of the Church; no wonder that they came to no conclusion. But whatever might be the secret thoughts of each party as to the fate of his antagonist on the Day of Judgment, they parted with seeming mutual respect.

Nicolas V. was to behold, as it were, the final act of homage to the Popedom, from the majesty of ^{Coronation} the Empire. He was to be the last Pontiff ^{of the} Emperor. who was to crown at Rome the successor of Charlemagne; Frederick III. the last Emperor who was so to receive his crown from the hands of the Pope. Æneas Sylvius is again in Italy; he is the harbinger of the Emperor, who is about to descend into Italy to meet his Portuguese bride, to consummate his marriage, and at the same time to celebrate his Coronation at Rome. The Free cities were always troubled, and were thrown into a tumult of intrigue, if not of feud, by the appearance of the Emperor in Italy. Guelph turned pale, Ghibelline brightened. Sienna was under popular government. Would the Emperor's favorite, the favorite of the Pope, the heir of the proud but fallen house of Piccolomini, now their Bishop, forego the opportunity of seizing for his own family the lordship of the city?¹ Sienna, which the year before had thronged out to meet Æneas, received him in sullen silence; no one visited him, his name was heard muttered with low curses in the streets. Æneas, as he says, smiled at the sudden change (did not his vanity magnify his own unpopularity, and the jealousy of the city?). He assembled the Senate, assured them of the peaceful and unambitious views of himself, his family, and of the Emperor. The Siennese suppressed, but could not conceal their mistrust. Æneas having splendidly buried his colleague in the Embassy, who died at Sienna, thought it most prudent to go down to Telamona, in order to be in readiness to receive the Portuguese Princess.

Pope Nicolas himself began to look with alarm at

¹ Vit. Frederic. III. p. 244.

the approach of the Emperor. There were suspicious movements at Rome; more than suspicions, of the dire designs of Stephen Porcaro and his partisans, which broke out during the next year.

The pride and the felicity of Nicolas V. was in the undisturbed peace of Italy, at least of Roman Italy; who could foretell what strange or unexpected tumults might arise at the appearance of the Emperor? He sent to delay the march of Frederick, at least till the summer; he urged the want of provisions, of preparation, the dangers of a winter journey. Æneas was indignant at this timid vacillation of the Pope; "it became not the supreme Pontiff to say one thing to-day, another to-morrow." He assured Pope Nicolas of the pacific intentions of the Emperor. He appealed to the conduct of the Emperor to the Church; if he had been an enemy to the Church, the whole majesty of the Clergy had been crushed; we had not had the joy of beholding you in your present state of power and authority.¹ He wrote courteous letters to urge the immediate descent of Frederick.²

Tumults in Austria detained the Emperor; stormy weather his bride. Æneas Sylvius spent sixty weary days at Telamona.³ At length, on the same day, the Emperor entered Florence, his bride Leghorn. They met at Sienna. Sienna thought it well to appear to be full of joy, was delighted with the urbanity and conde-

¹ Si voluisset tantum pessum ibat Ecclesia: cleri majestas omnis extinguatur; nec tu hodie in hoc statu esses, in quo te videntes lætamur, p. 191.

² The most full account of this affair, with the letter of Æneas to the Pope, is in the Hist. Frederic. III. apud Kollar, p. 187 *et seq.*

³ He whiled away his time by visiting the old Etrurian cities in the neighborhood. Æneas had a remarkable, almost a premature, taste for antiquities and for the beauties of nature.

scension of the Emperor, renounced her suspicions of Æneas, recalled all his kindred, some of whom, with other nobles, were in exile ; and entreated the Bishop, whom the people now called the father of his country, to represent the City before the Pope.

The imperial cavalcade set off for Rome. As they descended the Ciminian hill, which overhangs Viterbo, the Emperor called Æneas to his side. "I shall live to see you Cardinal, I shall live to see you Pope." Æneas, with proper modesty, protested that he did not aspire to either of these perilous dignities. At Rome the marriage was solemnized by the Pope ^{March 18,} himself,¹ afterwards the Coronation with great ^{1452.} magnificence.² Æneas Sylvius made a speech for the Emperor. The day after, during an interview at which Æneas was present, the Emperor and the Pope communicated two extraordinary dreams.³ The Emperor, the last time that the Cardinal of Bologna left Vienna, had dreamed that he was crowned not by a Roman, but by the Cardinal of Bologna. "It is the privilege," said the Pope, "of those set up to rule the people to have true dreams. I myself dreamed that my predecessor Eugenius, the night before his death, had arrayed me in the Pontifical dress and mitre, and placed me on the throne. Take thou my seat, I depart to St. Peter." The humble Thomas of Sarzana had not been without his ambition!⁴ The prediction of the Emperor, as to the advancement of Æneas Sylvius, now

¹ Æneas Sylvius describes the whole at great length, p. 277 *et seq.*

² The cautious Pope had arrayed all the militia of the city, and occupied St. Angelo and the other strongholds with an imposing force to keep the peace.

³ Muratori, sub ann.

⁴ Vita Frederic. p. 296.

on such amicable terms with the Pope, might have been expected to meet its own immediate accomplishment, as far as the Cardinalate. Æneas, however, received only a barren promise, which Pope Nicolas did not live to fulfil. But he returned to Germany Papal Ambassador and Legate to Bohemia, Silesia, Austria, Moravia, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, — afterwards, at the Emperor's request, to Hungary. The Legatine character gave him great weight, he exercised it with his accustomed sagacity, and in perfect fidelity to Frederick. He was armed, as Legate, with Papal censures against all the enemies of Frederick. But these Austrian affairs belong not to our history.

Throughout Christendom, except in the narrow corner of Bohemia, Pope Nicolas V. ruled supreme. Yet even Nicolas V. was not secure against the inextinguishable turbulence of the Roman people. The republicanism of the Crescentii, of Arnold of Brescia, of Brancalone, of Rienzi, of Baroncelli, had still its champions and its martyrs. Stephen Porcaro was the last heir, till very modern times, of this dangerous and undying race. Stephen Porcaro was of equestrian family, of powerful and kindling eloquence. On the death of Eugenius (Eugenius himself had been driven from Rome by popular insurrection) Porcaro had urged the rising of the people, the proclamation of the Republic.¹ Pope Nicolas, anxious to conciliate all orders, appointed the dangerous demagogue on a mission in the Roman territory. On his return Porcaro renewed his agitation. He boldly avowed his opinions, and almost

¹ *Dicens omnem servitutem turpem, foedissimam autem quæ præbyteris præstaretur, rogabatque Romanos, dum Cardinales clausi essent, aliquod audere pro libertate.* Æneas Sylvius, V. Fred. III. p. 135.

announced himself as defender of the liberties of the Roman people. He was sent in honorable exile to Bologna, under the sole restraint that he should present himself every day before Bessarion, the Cardinal Legate. He returned secretly to Rome. A conspiracy had been organized in which the nephew of Porcaro took the lead. Stephen Porcaro harangued the conspirators, inveighed against the tyranny of the rulers, the arbitrary proscription, the banishment, even the execution, of Roman citizens. He declared that it was ignominious that the city which had ruled the world should be subject to the dominion of priests, who were women rather than men.¹ He would cast off forever the degrading yoke. He had at his command three hundred hired soldiers. Four hundred noble Romans were ready to appear in arms. He appealed to their cupidity as to their patriotism: to-morrow they might be in possession of a million of gold pieces.² If the aims of Porcaro were noble, his immediate designs, the designs with which he was charged, and with seeming truth,³ were those of the robber, the bloody and cowardly assassin.⁴ The contemplated mode of insurrection had the further horror of impious sacrilege. The Pope and the Cardinals were to be surprised while solemnizing the mass on the festival of the Epiphany. The Papal stables near the church were to be set on

¹ *Turpe esse dictitans eam urbem, quæ totum sibi subjecerit orbem, nunc sacerdotum imperio subjacere, quos rectius foeminas quam viros quisque appellaverit. Æneas Sylvius, Europa, p. 459.*

² Zantfliet, *Stephen Infessura*, Platina.

³ *Vita Nicolai V.* p. 128.

⁴ Sismondi, true to his republican bias, raises Stephen Porcaro to a hero and a martyr; and while he perhaps exaggerates the cruelty of the Pope, hardly touches on its justification, the atrocity of the plot. When will Italian freedom forswear assassination as its first and favorite weapon?

fire. In the tumult Porcaro was to appear in purple and with the ensigns of magistracy, to force or gain his way as a worshipper towards the altar. The Pope was to be seized; it was said that the chains were found, chains of gold, which had been displayed to the insurgents, which were to fetter his holy person,¹ only, however, to be thrown into a dungeon as a hostage to compel his brother to surrender the Castle of St. Angelo. His after-fate was perhaps to be that of his brethren the Cardinals, who were to be massacred without mercy. The shaven crown was no longer to be an object of fear or respect in Rome.² The insurgents had nicely calculated the amount of plunder: from the Palace of the Pope 200,000 florins; from the Sacred College 200,000; from the merchants and public officers 200,000; from the magazines and salt depôts 200,000; from the confiscated property of the enemies of the revolution 100,000.

The conspiracy was detected or betrayed.³ The house where the conspirators assembled was surrounded with troops. Porcaro escaped, but was found next day, hidden by his sister in a chest. Sciarra Porcaro, the nephew, cut his way through the soldiers and fled. Many servants and quantities of arms were found in the house. The very day of his capture the bodies of Stephen Porcaro and nine of his accomplices were seen hanging from the battlements of the Castle of St. Angelo. They had in vain implored confession and

¹ Ad colligandum ait præsulem, catenam auream secum attulit, a se jampridem paratam quam congregatis ostendit. *Æn. Syl. Europa*, p. 460.

² Velle enim aiebat se id agere, ut æternum intra hæc mœnia capitis rasi dentes vereri non oporteret. Leo Alberti.

³ According to Stefano Infessura they attacked one hundred of the Pope's guards, and killed the Marescallo.

the last sacrament. Many other executions followed. Two Canons of St. Peter's were involved in the plot: one was found innocent and released; the other fled to Damascus, where he remained till after the death of the Pope. Large rewards were offered for some who had escaped: one thousand ducats if produced alive, five hundred if dead. Some were allowed to be seized in Padua and Venice. The Cardinal of Metz interceded for Battista Persona; it was alleged that he was guiltless. The Pope promised mercy: whether on new evidence or not, he was hung the next morning: the indignant Cardinal left Rome.

The Pope was bitterly mortified at this ingratitude of the Roman people for his mild government, the peace which they enjoyed, the wealth which had poured into the city, the magnificent embellishments of Rome. He became anxious and morose. Remorse for blood, if necessarily, too prodigally shed, would weigh heavily on a Pope who had shrunk from war as unchristian.¹ The famous architect Leo Alberti (employed, it is true, by Nicolas V. in his splendid designs for St. Peter's) describes the unexampled state of prosperity enjoyed under Nicolas, for which the conspirators would have made that cruel return. "The whole of Latium was at peace: the last thing to be expected was that any

¹ See in Collier (i. p. 672) the curious account of Porcare's conspiracy given in England by the Pope's Nuncio Clement Vincentio: "It was drawn," said the Nuncio, "from the brothels and profligates of Rome." The Nuncio suggests a form of public thanksgiving for the Pope's deliverance, and intimates that a letter from the English clergy would be acceptable, denouncing Rome as degenerating to the licentiousness of old Babylon, and advising the Pope to leave the wicked city, and reside in some other country. The Nuncio and Collector was also to hint the expediency of a subsidy to enable the Pope to leave Rome and Italy. The form of prayer was issued, says Collier, but no more done.

Roman could think to change the state of affairs for the better by a revolution. The domain of the Church was in a high state of cultivation ; the city had become a city of gold through the Jubilee ; the dignity of the citizens was respected ; all reasonable petitions were granted at once by the Pontiff. There were no exactions, no new taxes. Justice was fairly administered. It was the whole care of the Pope to adorn the city." The more devout and the more wealthy were indignant at the design to plunder and massacre the foreigners whose profuse wealth enabled the Romans to live in ease and luxury ; at the profanation of the Church by promiscuous slaughter, of the altar itself by blood ; the total destruction of the Cardinals, the priesthood, of religion itself ; the seizure of the Pope, whose feet distant potentates crowded to kiss on his sublime function of sacrifice ; the dragging him forth, loaded with chains, perhaps his death ! The calmest looked on the suppression of the conspiracy and the almost total extirpation of the conspirators with satisfaction.¹

Now came that event which, however foreseen by the few wiser prophetic spirits, burst on Europe and on Christendom with the stunning and appalling effect of absolute suddenness — the taking of Constantinople by the Turks. On no two European minds did this disaster work with more profound or more absorbing terror than on Pope Nicolas V. and Æneas Sylvius : nor could any one allege more sound reasons for that terror than the Pope and the Bishop of Sienna. Who could estimate better than Æneas, from his intimate knowl-

¹ Leo Battista Alberti. *Porraria Conjuratio* apud Muratori, xxv. p. 310.

edge of all the countries of Europe, of Italy, Germany, France, England, the extent of the danger which impended over the Latin world? Never since its earlier outburst might Mohammedanism seem so likely to subjugate if not to swallow up distracted and disunited Christendom, as under the Turks. By sea and land they were equally formidable. If Christendom should resist, on what frontier? All were menaced, all in danger. What city, what kingdom, would arrest the fierce, the perpetual invasion? From this period throughout the affairs of Germany (at Frankfort he preached a crusade) to the end of his Legatine power, of his Cardinalate, of his Papacy, of his life, this was the one absorbing thought, one passion, of Æneas Sylvius. The immediate advance of the victorious Mahomed through Hungary, Dalmatia, to the border, the centre of Italy, was stopped by a single fortress, Belgrade; by a preacher, John Capistrano; by a hero, John Huniades. But it was not A.D. 1472. till, above a century later, when Don John of Austria, at Lepanto by sea, and John Sobieski, before Vienna, by land, broke the spell of Mohammedan conquest, that Europe or Christendom might repose in security.¹

The death of Nicolas V. was hastened, it was said, by the taking of Constantinople. Grief, shame, fear worked on a constitution broken by the gout. But Nicolas V. foresaw not that in remote futurity the peaceful, not the warlike, consequences of the fall of Constantinople would be most fatal to the Popedom — that what was the glory of Nicolas V. would become among the foremost causes of the ruin of mediæval religion:

¹ Compare Gibbon, ch. lxvii. xii. p. 162.

that it would aid in shaking to the base, and in severing forever the majestic unity of Latin Christianity.¹

¹ I cannot refrain, though my History closes with Nicolas V., from subjoining a few sentences on the end of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

On the death of Nicolas V., the Cardinal Bessarion, for learning, dignity, character, stood high above the whole College of Cardinals. The election had been almost declared in his favor. The Cardinal of Avignon was seized with indignation. "Would they have for a Pope a Greek, a recent proselyte, a man with a beard? Was the Latin Church fallen so low that it must have recourse to the Greeks?" The jealousy of the West was roused: a Spaniard, the first of the fatal house of Borgia, was raised to the Papal throne, Callistus III. Æneas was at Frankfort, pressing on reluctant Germany a crusade against the Turks. The Germans thought more of their contest with the Pope than of the security of Christendom. Frederick III. was urged to seize the opportunity of the election of a new Pope to assert the liberties of the Empire and of the German Church. Æneas averted the strife, and persuaded the Emperor that he had more to hope than fear from the Pope. He was sent with the congratulations of the Emperor to Callistus III. A promotion of Cardinals was expected. The name of Æneas was in all men's mouths: he received congratulations. The Pope named but three, one his nephew, Borgia, the future Alexander VI. Æneas was about to return to Germany, but his presence was needed in Italy: Sienna was besieged by James Piccinino: war threatened between the Pope and Alfonso King of Naples. Æneas, as ambassador to Naples, secured an honorable treaty. The Pope would not lose, and was obliged to reward the indispensable Æneas. He was created Cardinal of Sienna (Dec. 1456).

So, without dishonor or ingratitude, Æneas Sylvius was released from the service of his Imperial master. The Cardinal must devote himself to the interests of the Church; the Italian to those of Italy. He need breathe no more the thick and heavy air of Germany.

A year and a half has passed, and Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Aug. 21, A. D. 1458) is Pope Pius II.

Few men of more consummate ability had sat on the throne of St. Peter; few men more disposed to maintain the Papal power to the height of its supremacy. He boldly, unreservedly, absolutely condemned the heretical tenets of Æneas Sylvius. He reproached the King of France for the audacious Pragmatic Sanction: it was not less sacrilegious, not less impious than the decrees of the Council of Basle. But Pius II. had the sagacity to know that the days of Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. were passed. He learnt by bitter experience that those too of Urban II. were gone by. It was not for want of exertion, or of eloquence far surpassing that which wrapt the Council of Clermont to frenzy, that Pius II. did not array Christendom in a more politic, more justifiable crusade against advancing Mohammedanism. Even the colder Council of Mantua seemed to kindle to

Nicolas V. aspired to make Italy the domicile, Rome the capital, of letters and arts. As to letters, his was

enthusiasm. Against the Turks Germany would furnish 42,000 men; Hungary, 20,000 horse, 20,000 foot. Burgundy 6000. The Duke of Burgundy accepted the command. Even the Italian kingdoms, dukedoms, republics, consented to be assessed. The Prince of Este threw down 300,000 florins. Italy was to raise a great fleet; France and Spain promised aid.

The proclamation of the Universal League of Christendom might seem a signal for a general war throughout Christendom. The war of the Roses raged in England; all Germany was in arms, bent on civil strife; the French fleet set sail, not against the Turks, but against Naples; Piccinino and Malatesta renewed the war in the Roman territory; the Savelli were in insurrection in Rome.

Pope Pius was not satisfied with endeavoring to rouse all Christendom to a crusade against the Turks: he undertook a more Christian, if a more desperate enterprise, the conversion of the Sultan. He published a long elaborate address to Mahomet II. Throughout this singular document the tone is courteous, conciliatory, almost flattering; not till its close, denunciatory against the imposture of the Koran. "Nothing was wanting to make Mahomet the mightiest sovereign the world had ever seen, nothing but a little water for his baptism, and belief in the Gospel. The world would bow down before Mahomet the Christian Emperor." "The great Sultan is no careless Atheist, no Epicurean; he believes in God and in the immortality of the soul. What has been the end of all great conquerors, — Semiramis, Hercules, Bacchus, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, Julius Cæsar, Attila, Tamerlane? They are all burning in the flames of hell. Your law allows all to be saved by their own religion, except renegades from Islam; we maintain, on the contrary, that all who believe not our creed must be damned." From this dangerous argument the Pope proceeds to enlarge on the Christian as contrasted with the Mohammedan faith. However justly he might argue on Christianity, the stern predestinarians of Islam must have been surprised at finding themselves charged with supposing the world ruled by chance, not by Providence. There is much more strange lore on Mohammedan superstitions and Arabian priestcraft. The Turks were of a noble Scythian race: the Pope marvels that they can follow Egyptians and Arabians in their religion: Christianity had been a far more congenial faith.

How strangely, how nobly did Pius II., at the close of his life, redeem the weaknesses, the treachery, the inconsistency, the unblushing effrontery of self-interest of his earlier years. Pius II. was the only Pope who, in his deep and conscientious devotion, would imperil his own sacred person in the Crusade against the Turks, and engage in a war, if ever justifiable in a Pope, justifiable when the liberty, the Christianity of Europe might seem on the hazard. At Ancona (A.D. 1463), amid the total desertion of the leaders pledged to the Holy War; amid the host of common soldiers, mur-

not the ostentatious patronage of a magnificent Sovereign ; nor was it the sagacious policy which would enslave to the service of the Church that of which it might anticipate the dangerous rebellion. It was not the religion of authority seeking to make itself master of all which might hereafter either confirm or contest that authority. In Nicolas it was pure and genuine, almost innate, love of letters. In his lowlier station the ambition, pride, pleasure, passion, avarice of Thomas of Sarzana had been the study, the collection, of books. In every country into which he followed the train of the Cardinal Legate, his object was the purchase of manuscripts or copies of them. The Cardinal di Santa Croce (Albergati) encouraged him by his munificence ; but the Cardinal's munificence could not keep pace with the prodigality of his follower. In his affluence Thomas devoted all he possessed to the same end, as in his poverty his most anxious fear had been lest he should be compelled to part with his treasures. So great was his reputation, that when Cosmo de' Medici proposed to open the Library of St. Marco at Flor-

muring that they had been paid only in Indulgences, in which they had ceased to trust, not in hard money ; a host starving for want of sustenance, which the Pope, once the cool and politic statesman, now become a sanguine, enthusiastic old man, had not thought of providing ; Pius II. alone maintained his courage. As the faith of others waxed cold, his became more ardent. He offered with one of his Cardinals to embark and throw himself into Ragusa, threatened by the Turks. And this refined and accomplished man died, as Peter the Hermit or St. Bernard might have died. The faithful Cardinal of Pavia watched his last moments. The sight of the sails of the Venetian fleet had for a moment kindled up all his ardor, but made him feel more deeply his failing strength. The Cardinal has described his end with the touching simplicity of real affection and reverence. " ' Pray for me, my son,' were his last words." His friends bewailed and honored him as a martyr in the cause of Christianity.*

* Comment. Card. Paviensis, p. 359.

ence, endowed with the books of Nicolo Nicoli, Thomas of Sarzana was requested to furnish a plan for the arrangement and for the catalogue. This became the model adopted in the other great libraries — that of the Badia at Florence, that of the Count of Montefeltro at Urbino, of Alexander Sforza at Pesaro. No sooner was Nicolas Pope than he applied himself to the foundation of the Vatican Library. Five thousand volumes were speedily collected. The wondering age boasted that no such library had existed since the days of the Ptolemies.

The scholars of Italy flocked to Rome, each to receive his task from the generous Pope, who rewarded their labors with ample payment. He seemed determined to enrich the West with all which survived of Grecian literature. The fall of Constantinople, long threatened, had been preceded by the immigration of many learned Greeks. Some, as the Cardinal Bessarion, had been naturalized after the Council of Florence.¹ France, Germany, even England, the Byzantine Empire, Greece, had been ransacked by industrious agents for copies of all the Greek authors. No branch of letters was without its interpreters. Notwithstanding the bold writings of Laurentius Valla, who had already startled the world by his discovery of the fraud of Constantine's donation, he was intrusted with the translation of Herodotus and Thucydides. Poggio undertook the Cyropædia of Xenophon and Diodorus Siculus; Nicolas Perotto, Polybius. Guarino of Verona and George of Tiferna, Strabo, the latter four books of Dion Prusæus, Pietro Candido, Appian.

¹ Compare *Disquisitio de Nicolao V. Pont. Max. erga literas et literarios viros patrocinio*. Ad calc. Vit. Nicol. V. a Dominico Georgio. Roma, 1742.

Of the philosophers, Perotto sent out the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus; Theodore of Gaza some of the works of Theophrastus, and of Aristotle: George of Trebisonde, the *Laws* of Plato. On George of Trebisonde was imposed the more arduous task, the *Almagest* of Ptolemy. Lilius Ægidius contributed some of the works of the Alexandrian Philo. From Rinuccio of Arezzo came the *Life and Fables* of Æsop and the letters of Hippocrates; from John Aurispa, the *Commentary* of Hierocles on the golden verses of Pythagoras. Nicolas had an ardent desire to read the two great poems of Homer in Latin verse. They were only known by the prose version of Leontius Pilatus, executed under the care of Boccaccio. Philelpho, whom the Pope had received with eager cordiality, and bestowed on him, as a first gift, 500 golden ducats, relates, that just before his death, the Pope offered him a fine palace in Rome, and farms in the Roman territory, which would maintain his whole family in ease and honor, and to deposit ten thousand pieces of gold, to be paid when he should have finished the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.¹

Nor were the Fathers of the Greek Church without due honor. Basil, the two Gregories, Cyril, the *Evangelic Preparation* of Eusebius by George of Trebisonde, a new version of Dionysius the Areopagite, opened the theology of the Greeks to the inquiring West.²

There was not as yet any awful apprehension of im-

¹ Epist. Philipp. quoted in the *Disquisitio*, p. 194. Æneas Sylvius says that a certain Horace of Rome was employed on the *Iliad*. Part of the first book in Latin verse, with a dedication to Nicolas V., is in the Vatican.

² Nicolas obtained a copy of the *Commentaries* of Chrysostom on St. Matthew, which had been so rare in the west, that Aquinas had said he would rather possess it than the city of Paris.

pairing the sacred majesty of the Vulgate Bible. Mannotti, a Florentine, in his day the most famous for his erudition, was authorized and urged to execute a new version of the whole Scriptures from the Hebrew and the Greek. He completed the Psalms from the Syriac, the whole New Testament, except perhaps the Acts of the Apostles.

Thus to Nicolas V., Italy, or rather Latin Christianity, mainly owes her age of learning, as well as its fatal consequence to Rome and to Latin Christianity, which in his honest ardor he would be the last to foresee. It was the splendid vision of Nicolas V. that this revival of letters, which in certain circles became almost a new religion, would not be the bondslave but the handmaid or willing minister of the old. Latin Christianity was to array itself in all the spoils of the ancient world, and so maintain as a natural result (there was nothing of policy in his thought), and with increasing and universal veneration, her dominion over the mind of man. The rebellion of Letters, and the effects of that rebellion, we must hereafter endeavor to explain.

But Rome under Nicolas V. was not to be the centre of letters alone, she was to resume her rank ^{Progress of human intellect.} as the centre of Art, more especially of architectural magnificence. Rome was to be as of old the Lawgiver of Civilization; pilgrims from all parts of the world, from curiosity, for business or from religion, were to bow down before the confessed supremacy of her splendid works.

The century from the death of Boniface VIII. to the accession of Martin V., during the Avignonese exile, and the Schism, had been a period of disaster, neglect, decay, ruin; of that slow creeping, crumbling

ruin, which is perhaps more fatal to ancient cities than conflagration, usually limited in its ravages, or the irruption of barbarous enemies.¹ Martin V. had made some advances to the restoration of the financial prosperity of the Popedom; Eugenius IV. had reasserted the endangered spiritual supremacy. Both had paid some attention to the dilapidated churches, palaces, walls of the city. Under Nicolas V. Rome aspired to rise again at once to her strength and to her splendor. The Pope was to be a great Sovereign Prince, but above the Sovereign Prince he was to be the successor of St. Peter. Rome was to be at once the strong citadel, and the noblest sanctuary in the world, unsailable by her enemies both without and within from her fortifications; commanding the world to awe by the unrivalled majesty of her churches. The Jubilee had poured enormous wealth into the Treasury of the Pope; his ordinary revenues, both from the Papal territory and from Christendom at large, began to flow in with peace and with the revival of his authority. That wealth was all expended with the most liberal magnificence. Already had it dawned upon the mind of Nicolas V. that the Cathedral of the Chief of the Apostles ought to rival, or to surpass all the churches in Christendom in vastness and majesty. It was to be entirely rebuilt from its foundations.² Julius II. and Leo X. did but accomplish the design of Nicolas V.

¹ Read Petrarch's well-known letter—Gibbon. Bunsen and Platner. *Roms Beschreibung*.

² Georgio, in his *Life of Nicolas V.*, says (p. 166), *Basilicam vero St. Petri Principis Apostolorum a fundamentis magnifice inchoare et perficere meditabatur*. In the *Life of Manetti* (Muratori, I. R. T.) vol. iii. is a long description of the plan of the church, and the design of the Pope. See also Bonanni *Templi Vaticani Historia*, c. xi., with the references.

Had Nicolas lived, Bramante and Michael Angelo might have been prematurely anticipated by Rosellini of Florence and Leo Battista Alberti. He had even erected an august and spacious Tribune, to be swept away with the rest of the building by his bolder and more ambitious successors. The mosaic pavement in the apse, begun by Nicolas V., was completed by Paul II., at the cost of more than 5000 pieces of gold.¹

By the side, and under the shadow of this noblest of churches, the Supreme Pontiff was to have his most stately palace. The Lateran, and the Palace near St. Maria Maggiore, sumptuously restored by Nicolas V., were to bow before this more glorious edifice. The description may still be read of its spacious courts, its cool green gardens, its dashing fountains, its theatre, its hall for public ceremonies, for the conclave and the Pontifical coronation, the treasury, the library; this chamber, perhaps as dearest to the tastes of Nicolas, was the first part, if not the only part achieved.

The Palace had its three stories for summer, for winter, and for spring, even to the offices and kitchens.² The Cardinals were to dwell around the Pope, if in less lofty, yet still in noble Palaces. The Vatican was to be the Capital of the Capital of Christendom. The whole Leonine city, which had too long lain almost open to the invading stranger, and was not safe from the turbulent Romans, was to expand in security as well as splendor around the residence of St. Peter and his successors. The bridge of St. Angelo was bordered with turrets for defence and ornament; the Castle of St. Angelo, the citadel which commanded the bridge,

¹ Georgio, p. 167.

² In Manetti's Life of Nicolas V.

was strengthened by outward bulwarks, and by four towers at the corners, within laid out into halls and chambers. It was connected by strong walls with the Vatican; a huge tower began to rise, the commencement of formidable works of defence beyond the gardens of the Vatican. From the bridge of St. Angelo three broad streets, with open porticoes, and shops within them, were to radiate; the central one led direct to the portico of St. Peter's, before which Nicolas V. designed to set up the famous obelisk, which Sixtus V. at infinite cost, and with all the science of Fontana, hardly succeeded in placing on its base. The street to the left ran along the Tiber; that to the right, to the Vatican and the Palatine Gate.

Nor did the Pontiff design to expend all his munificence on St. Peter's and the Vatican. Decay, from violence or want of repair, had fallen on the forty churches called the Stations, visited by the more solemn processions, especially those which, with St. Peter's, made the more Holy Seven, the Lateran, St. Maria Maggiore, St. Stephen on Monte Celio, the Apostles, St. Paul and St. Lorenzo beyond the walls. All shared more or less in his restoring bounty. Three other churches, St. Maria beyond the Tiber, St. Theodore, St. Prassede were rebuilt; the Pantheon, now consecrated to the Virgin and all Saints, was covered with a roof of lead.

The Pontiff would secure the city from foreign foes, who for centuries, either through the feuds, the perfidy, or the turbulence of the Romans themselves, or from their own ambition or hostility, had desolated the city. In the whole circuit, from the Porta Flumentana to the Pyramid of Cestius, and so all round the city, the walls

were strengthened, towers erected, fosses deepened. The Capitol was restored to its ancient strength and solidity. In order to convey his building materials to the city, perhaps provisions, he cleansed the channel of the Anio; he repaired the stately aqueduct which brought the Acqua Vergine to the Fountain of Trevi. He restored the Milvian bridge.

The munificence of Nicolas confined not itself to Rome. Everywhere in the Roman territory rose churches, castles, public edifices. Already the splendid church of St. Francis, at Assisi, wanted repair: Nicolas built a church dedicated to St. Francis, at his favored town of Fabriano; one at Gualdo in Umbria, to St. Benedict. Among his princely works was a castle at Fabriano, great buildings at Centumcellæ, the walls of Civita Castellana, a citadel at Narni, with bulwarks and deep fosses; another at Civita Vecchia; baths near Viterbo; buildings for ornament and for defence at Spoleto.¹

The younger Arts, Sculpture and Painting began under his auspices still further to improve. Fra Angelico painted at Rome at the special command or request of Nicolas V.

Nicolas V., on his death-bed, communicated to the Cardinals, who stood around in respectful sorrow, his last Will and Testament. This solemn appeal, as it

¹ On the astonishment and admiration excited by the buildings of Nicolas V., read the passages of Æneas Sylvius, Vit. Frederic. III. "Quantum vero animo hic valeret, et quam vastus sit ejus animus, ejus ædificia monstrant, quo nemo aut magnificentius aut celerius aut splendidius quam ipse ædificavit. Nam turres et muri per eum constructi nulli priscorum arte vel magnitudine cedunt." — P. 138. "Namque ut priscorum Cæsarum moles totius urbis structura superat, sic ædificia Nicolai Papæ, quicquid ubique esset, moderni laboris excellunt." — P. 282. The Emperor Frederick, himself an excellent architect, stood in amazement.

were, to God and man, after a copious and minute confession of faith, turned to his architectural works. These holy and worldly edifices he had raised not from ambition, from pride, from vainglory, or for the perpetuation of his name, but for two great ends, the maintenance of the authority of the Church of Rome, and her more commanding dignity above all Christian people, as well as her security against lawless persecution. The majesty of such sacred imperishable monuments profoundly impresses the mind of man with the perpetuity, the eternity of religion. As to the secular buildings, the walls, towers, citadels, he recounts the dangers, the persecutions of Popes from early days; Popes insulted, Popes dethroned, Popes imprisoned, Popes banished, Popes murdered, from Eugenius II. through all the darker ages, down to the conspiracy of Stephen Porcaro against himself. These were his motives for the conception and execution of so many sumptuous and so solid edifices. He proceeds to that sad burden on his weary soul, the taking of Constantinople. He boasts with some, but surely blameless pride, of the peace of Italy; he had restrained, allayed, appeased the fierce wars among all the Princes and all the Republics.¹

Nor does he speak with less satisfaction or delight of his own labors in the cause of Letters; the purchase of books, the copying of manuscripts, the encouragement of scholars; he appeals to the personal knowledge of the Cardinals, to the world, even to higher judgment,

¹ " *Bella ipsa, quibus undique frementibus jampridem tota hinc inde Italia vexabatur, ita compescuimus, ita denique sedavimus, ut omnes Principes, Respublicas, et Italos Populos ad maximam concordiam summamque pacem induceremus.*"

on his acquisition and his employment of the wealth of the Pontificate: "all these and every other kind of treasure, were not accumulated by avarice, not by simony, not by largesses, not by parsimony, as ye know; but only through the grace of the most merciful Creator, the peace of the Church, and the perpetual tranquillity of my Pontificate."¹

Thus in Nicolas V. closed one great age of the Papacy. In Nicolas the Sovereign Italian Prince and the Pontiff met in serene and amicable dignity; he had no temptation to found a princely family. But before long the Pontiff was to be lost in the Sovereign Prince. Nor was it less evident that the exclusive dominion of Latin Christianity was drawing to a close, though nearly a century might elapse before the final secession of Teutonic Christianity, and the great permanent division of Christendom. Each successive Pontificate might seem determined to advance, to hasten that still slow but inevitable revolution; the audacious nepotism of Sixtus IV., the wickednesses of Alexander VI., which defy palliation; the wars of Julius II., with the hoary Pope at the head of ferocious armies; the political intrigues and disasters of Clement VII.

¹ "Hæc omnia pleraque alia divitiarum et gazarum genera nobis non ex avaritiâ, non ex simoniâ, non ex largitionibus, non ex parsimoniâ ut scitis, sed ex divinâ duntaxat benignissimi Creatoris gratiâ, et ex pace Ecclesiasticâ perpetuâque Pontificatus noster tranquillitate provenisse non dubitamus." — Ibid. Manetti seems to assert that this long testament was read by the dying Pope. The improbability of this throws no doubt on its authenticity

BOOK XIV.



CHAPTER I.

SURVEY.

FROM the reign of Nicolas V. and the close of our history, as from a high vantage ground, we must survey the whole realm of Latin Christendom — the political and social state, as far as the relation of Latin Christianity to the great mass of mankind, the popular religion, with its mythology; the mental development in philosophy, letters, arts.

Eight centuries and a half had elapsed since the Pontificate of Gregory the Great — the epoch of the supreme dominion of Latin Christianity in the West. The great division of mankind, which at that time had become complete and absolute, into the clergy (including the monks, in later days the friars) and the rest of mankind, still subsisted in all its rigorous force. They were two castes, separate and standing apart as by the irrepealable law of God. They were distinct, adverse, even antagonistic, in their theory of life, in their laws, in their corporate property, in their rights, in their immunities. In the aim and object of their existence, in their social duties and position, they were set asunder by a broad, deep, impassable line. But the ecclesiastical caste being bound, at least by its law, to celibacy,

in general could not perpetuate its race in the ordinary course of nature; it was renewed by drawing forth from the laity men either endowed with or supposed to be trained to a peculiar mental turn, those in whom the intellectual capacity predominated over the physical force. Religion, which drove many out of the world within the sacred circle, might be a sentiment, a passion, an unthinking and unreasoning impulse of the inward being: holy ignorance might be the ambition, the boast, of some monks, and of the lower friars; but in general the commission to teach the religion implied (though itself an infused gift or grace, and the inseparable consequence of legitimate consecration to the office) some superiority of mind. At all events the body was to be neglected, sacrificed, subdued, in order that the inner being might ripen to perfection. The occupations of the clergy were to be in general sedentary, peaceful, quiescent. Their discipline tended still further to sift, as it were, this more intellectual class: the dull and negligent sunk into the lower offices, or, if belonging by their aristocratic descent to the higher, they obtained place and influence only by their race and connections, wealth and rank by unclerical powers of body and of mind. These were ecclesiastics by profession, temporal princes, even soldiers, by character and life. But this, according to the strict theory of the clerical privilege, was an abuse, an usurpation. Almost all minds which were gifted with or conscious of great intellectual capacity, unless kings, or nobles, or knights, whose talents might lead to military distinction, appeared predestined for, were irresistibly drawn into, or were dedicated by their prescient parents or guardians to the Church. The younger sons, especially the

illegitimate sons, even of kings, far more of princes and nobles, were devoted, as the Church became wealthy and powerful, to this career as a provision. But even with this there either was, or according to general opinion there ought to have been, some vocation and some preparation: many of these were among the ablest, some even among the most austere and pious of churchmen. The worst, if they did not bring the more fitting qualifications, brought connection, famous names (in feudal times of great importance), and thus welded together, as it were, the Church with the State.

Education, such as it was (and in many cases for the Education. times it was a high education), had become, with rare exceptions, their exclusive privilege. Whoever had great capacities or strong thirst for knowledge could neither obtain nor employ it but in the peaceful retirement, under the sacred character, with the special advantages of the churchman, or in the cloister. The whole domain of the human intellect was their possession. The universities, the schools, were theirs, and theirs only. There the one strife was between the secular clergy and the regulars — the monks, or the friars the disciples of St. Dominic and St. Francis. They were the canon lawyers, and for some centuries, as far as it was known or in use, the teachers and professors of the civil law. They were the historians, the poets, the philosophers. It was the first omen of their endangered supremacy that the civil lawyers in France rose against them in bold rivalry. When in the Empire the study of the old Roman law developed principles of greater antiquity, therefore, it was asserted, of greater authority than the canon law, it was at once a

sign and a proof that their absolute dominion was drawing towards its close — that human intellect was finding another road to distinction and power. Physical science alone, in general, though with some famous exceptions, they unwisely declined: they would not risk the popular suspicion of magical and forbidden arts — a superstition which themselves indulged and encouraged. The profound study of the human body was thought inconsistent with the fastidious modesty of their profession.¹ The perfection of medicine and of all cognate inquiries, indeed in general of natural philosophy itself, was left to Jews and Arabs: the great schools of medicine, Montpellier and Salerno, as they derived their chief wisdom from these sources, so they freely admitted untensured, perhaps unbaptized students. It is difficult to calculate the extent of this medical influence, which must have worked, if in secret, still with great power. The jealousy and hatred with which Jews or supposed unbelievers are seen at the courts of kings is a secret witness to that influence. At length we find the king's physician, as under Louis XI., the rival in authority of the king's confessor. In this alone the hierarchical caste does not maintain its almost exclusive dominion over all civil as well as ecclesiastical transactions.

For it is not only from their sacred character, but from their intellectual superiority, that they are in the courts, in the councils, of kings; that they are the negotiators, the ambassadors of sovereigns; they alone can read and draw up state papers, compacts, treaties,

¹ The observant Chaucer gives the converse. Physicians were then under the evil fame of irreligion. "His studie was but littel on the Bible." Prologue on the Doctor of Physique.

or frame laws. Writing is almost their special mystery ; the notaries, if not tonsured, as they mostly were, are directed, ordered by the Clergy : they are in general the servants and agents of ecclesiastics. In every kingdom of Europe the Clergy form one of the estates, balance or blindly lead the nobles ; and this too not merely as churchmen and enrolled in the higher service of God, but from their felt and acknowledged preëminence in the administration of temporal affairs.

To this recognized intellectual superiority, arising out of the power of selecting the recruits for their army according to their mental stature, their sole possession of the discipline necessary to train such men for their loftier position, and the right of choosing, as it were, their officers out of this chosen few — must be added their spiritual authority, their indefeasible power of predeclaring the eternal destiny of every living layman.

To doubt the sentence of that eternal destiny was now an effort of daring as rare as it was abhorrent to the common sense of men. Those who had no religion had superstition ; those who believed not trembled and were silent ; the speculative unbeliever, if there were such, shrouded himself in secrecy from mankind, even from himself : the unuttered lawless thought lay deep in his own heart. Those who openly doubted the unlimited power of the clergy to absolve were sects, outcasts of society, proscribed not only by the detestation of the clergy, but by the popular hatred. The keys of heaven and hell were absolutely in the hands of the priesthood — even more, in this life they were not without influence. In the events of war, in the distribution of earthly misery or blessing, abundance or famine, health or pestilence, they were the inter-

cessors with the saints, as the saints were intercessors with heaven. They were invested in a kind of omniscience. Confession, since the decree of the Lateran Council under Innocent III., an universal, obligatory, indispensable duty, laid open the whole heart of every one, from the Emperor to the peasant, before the priesthood; the entire moral being of man, undistinguishable from his religious being, was under their supervision and control, asserted on one side, acknowledged on the other. No act was beyond their cognizance, no act, hardly any thought, was secret. They were at once a government and a police, to which every one was bound to inform against himself, to be the agent of the most rigid self-delation, to endure the closest scrutiny, to be denied the least evasion or equivocation, to be submitted to the moral torture of menaced, of dreaded damnation if he concealed or disguised the truth, to undergo the most crushing, humiliating penance. Absolution, after which the soul thirsted with insatiable thirst, might be delayed, held in suspense, refused; if granted it was of inestimable price. The sacraments, absolutely necessary to spiritual life, were at their disposal. Baptism to the infant would hardly be refused; but the Eucharist, Christ himself offered on the altar, God made by consecrated hands, God materialized down to the rudest apprehension, could be granted or withheld according to the arbitrary, irresponsible judgment of the priest. The body, after death, might repose in consecrated ground with the saints, or be cast out, to be within the domain, the uncontested prey of devils. The Excommunication cut the man off, whatever his rank or station, from the Church, beyond whose pale was utter impossibility of

salvation. No one could presume to have hope for a man who died under excommunication. Such were the inculcated, by most recognized, at least apprehended, doctrines. The Interdict, the special prerogative of the Pope, as the antagonist, the controller of Sovereigns, smote a kingdom with spiritual desolation, during which the niggardly and imperfect rites, the baptism sparingly administered, the rest of the life without any religious ceremony, the extreme unction or the last sacrament coldly vouchsafed to the chosen few, the church-yard closed against the dead, seemed to consign a whole nation, a whole generation, to irrevocable perdition.

Thus throughout the world no man could stand alone ; the priest was the universal lord of the universal human conscience. The inward assurance of faith, of rectitude, of virtue, of love of man or love of God, without the ratification of the confessor ; the witness of the spirit within, unless confirmed, avouched by the priest, was nothing. Without the passport to everlasting life, everlasting life must recede from the hopes, from the attainment of man. And by a strange yet perhaps unavoidable anomaly, the sacredness of the priest was inalienable, indelible, altogether irrespective of his life, his habits, his personal holiness or unholiness. There might be secret murmurs at the avarice, pride, licentiousness of the priest : public opinion might even in some cases boldly hold him up to shame and obloquy, he was still priest, bishop, pope ; his sacraments lost not their efficacy, his verdict of condemnation or absolution was equally valid ; all the acts of John XXIII., till his deposal, were the acts of the successor of St. Peter. And if this triumph over the

latent moral indignation of mankind was the manifestation of its strength, so its oppugnancy to that indignation was its fall ; it was the premonition, the proclamation of its silent abrogation in the hearts of men. The historian has to state the fact, rather than curiously and judicially to balance the good and evil (for good there undoubtedly was, vast good in such ages of class tyrannizing over class, of unintermitting war on a wide or a narrow scale, of violence, lawlessness, brutality) in this universal sacerdotal domination.

It is impossible to estimate the fluctuating proportion between these two castes of the Christian ^{Monks and} population to each other. The number of ^{Friars.} the Secular Clergy was of course, to a certain extent, limited by the spiritual wants of the community and the means of maintenance. But it comprehended within the sacred circle of immunity and privilege a vast host of unenrolled and subordinate retainers, those who had received for some purpose of their own, some who in the ruder ages had been compelled to take the simple tonsure, some admitted to what were called the lower orders, and who in all large churches, as sub-deacons, acolytes, singers, were very numerous, down to those who held more menial offices, sacristans, beadles, servants of all classes. But there was absolutely nothing to limit the number of Monks, still less that of the Friars in their four Orders, especially the disciples of St. Dominic and St. Francis. No one was too poor or too low to become a privileged and sacred Mendicant. No qualification was necessary but piety or its semblance, and that might too easily be imitated. While these Orders in the Universities boasted of the most erudite and subtile, and all-accomplished of the School-

men, they could not disdain or altogether reject those who in the spirit, at least of one of their Founders, maintained the superiority of holy ignorance. Instead of being amazed that the Friars swarmed in such hordes over Christendom, it is rather wonderful that the whole abject and wretched peasantry, rather than be trampled to the earth, or maddened to Flagellantism, Jacquerie, or Communism, did not all turn able-bodied religious Beggars, so the strong English sense of Wycliffe designates the great mass of the lower Franciscans in England. The Orders themselves, as was natural when they became wealthy and powerful, must have repressed rather than encouraged the enrolment of such persons; instead of prompting to the utmost, they must have made it a distinction, a difficulty, a privilege, to be allowed to enter upon the enjoyment of their comparatively easy, roving, not by all accounts too severe life. To the serf inured to the scanty fare and not infrequent famine, the rude toil and miserable lodging; and to the peasant with his skin hard to callousness and his weather-beaten frame, the fast, the maceration, even the flagellation of the Friar, if really religious (and to the religious these self-inflicted miseries were not without their gratification), must have been no very rigorous exchange; while the freedom to the serf, the power of wandering from the soil to which he was bound down, the being his own property, not that of another, must have been a strong temptation. The door must have been closed with some care; some stern examination, probation, or inquiry, must have preceded the initiation and the adoption of brethren into the fraternity, or the still enlarging houses had been too narrow; they would have multiplied into unmanageable num-

bers. Yet, if more cold and repulsive in the admission of those humbler votaries, the protests of the Universities, and other proofs, show that the more promising and higher youth were sought with ardent proselytism.¹

The property, especially the territorial and landed property of the Hierarchy and the Monastic Orders, it is equally impossible to estimate. It varied, of course, in different ages, and in every kingdom in Christendom. Nor if we knew at any one time the proportionate extent of Church lands to that not under mortmain, would it be any measure, or any sure criterion, of their relative value. This property, instead of standing secure in its theoretic inalienability, was in a constant fluctuation: the Papal territory itself was frequently during the darker centuries usurped, recovered, granted away, resumed. Throughout Christendom the legal inalienability of Church lands was perpetually assailed in earlier times by bold depredators, and baffled by ingenious devices of granting away the usufruct. We have heard perpetual complaints against these kinds of endowments of their sons or descendants by the married clergy; the unmarried yet dissolute or extravagant beneficiaries, were no doubt as regardless of the sanctity of ecclesiastical property, and as subtle in conveying away its value to their kinsmen, or for their own immediate advantage. Besides all these estates, held in absolute property, was the tithe of the produce of

¹ On the degenerate state of the Friars the serious prose and the satirical poetry are full of details. Read too the Supplication of Beggars (a later production, temp. Henry VIII.), and the inimitable Colloquies of Erasmus. One of the reasons alleged at the Council of Trent against submitting the regulars to episcopal discipline was their "*numero eccessivo*." — Sarpi, lii. p. 158. Ed. Helmstadt.

all other lands.¹ The whole sacerdotal system of Latin Christianity, first from analogy, afterwards as direct precedent, assumed all the privileges, powers, rights, endowments of the Levitical priesthood; and thus arraying itself in the irrefragable authority of God's older Word, of which it did not acknowledge the abrogation where its interests were so nearly concerned, claimed the tithe as of inherent, perpetual, divine law. From an early period Christians had been urged to devote this proportion of their wealth to religious uses; a proportion so easy and natural that it had prevailed, and had obtained a prescriptive authority, as the rule of sacred oblation to the temples among the customs of many Heathen nations.² The perpetual claim to tithes was urged by Councils and by Popes in the sixth century. Charlemagne throughout his empire, King Ethelwolf, and, later, Edward the Confessor in England, either overawed by the declared authority of the Old Testament, or thinking it but a fair contribution to the maintenance of public worship and for other religious uses, gave the force of civil law to this presumed sacred obligation. During several centuries it was urged by the preachers, not merely as an indispensable part of Christian duty, but as a test of Christian perfection.³

¹ Hallam has summed up (Middle Ages, c. vii.) with his usual judgment and accuracy what is most important on this subject, in Father Paul, Muratori, Giannone, Fleury, and Schmidt.

² In the controversy which arose on the publication of Selden's book on Tithes, the High-Church writers, Montague and Tildesley, were diffuse and triumphant in their quotations from Heathen writers, as though, by showing the concurrence of universal religion with the Mosaic institutes, to make out tithes to be a part of Natural Religion. See abstract of their arguments in Collier.

³ Paolo Sarpi, quoted by Mr. Hallam.

Tithe was first received by the Bishop, and distributed by him in three or in four portions ; to himself, to the clergy, for the fabric of the churches, for the poor. But all kinds of irregularities crept into the simple and stately uniformity of this universal tax and its administration. It was retained by the Bishop ; the impoverished clergy murmured at their meagre and disproportionate share. As the parochial divisions became slowly and irregularly distinct and settled, it was in many cases, but by no means universally, attached to the cure of souls. The share of the fabric became uncertain and fluctuating, till at length other means were found for the erection and the maintenance of the Church buildings. The more splendid Prelates and Chapters, aided by the piety of Kings, Barons, and rich men, disdained this fund, so insufficient for their magnificent designs ; the building of churches was exacted from the devotion or the superstition of the laity in general, conjointly with the munificence of the ecclesiastics. So, too, the right of the poor to their portion became a free-will contribution, measured by the generosity or the wealth of the Clergy ; here a splendid, ever-flowing largess ; there a parsimonious, hardly-exacted dole.

The tithe suffered the fate of other Church property ; it was at times seized, alienated, appropriated by violence or by fraud. It was retained by the Bishops or wealthy clergy, who assigned a miserable stipend to a poor Vicar ; it fell into the hands of lay impropiators, who had either seized it, or, on pretence of farming it, provided in the cheapest manner for the performance of the service ; the Monasteries got possession of it in large portions, and served the cures from their Abbey

or Cloister. In England it was largely received by foreign Beneficiaries, who never saw the land from which they received this tribute.

Still, however levied, however expended, however invaded by what were by some held to be sacrilegious hands, much the larger part of this tenth of all the produce of the land throughout Christendom, with no deduction, except the moderate expense of collection, remained in the hands of the Hierarchy. It was gradually extended from the produce of land to all other produce, cattle, poultry, even fish.

The High Aristocracy of the Church, from the Pope to the member of the capitular body, might not disdain to participate in this, which ought to have been the exclusive patrimony of the parochial and laboring clergy: but their estates, which were Lordships, Baronages, Princedoms, in the Pope a kingdom, were what placed them on a level with, or superior to, the Knights, Barons, Princes, Kings of the world.

These possessions throughout Latin Christendom, both of the Seculars and of the Monasteries, if only calculated from their less clerical expenditure, on their personal pomp and luxury, on their wars, on their palaces, and from their more honorable prodigality on their cathedrals, churches, monastic buildings, must have been enormous; and for some period were absolutely exempt from contribution to the burdens of the State.¹ We have seen the first throes and struggles of Papal nepotism; we have seen bold attempts to quarter the kinsmen of Popes on the territories of the Papacy, to create noble patrimonies, or even principalities, in their favor; but there is no

¹ Some estates of the Church were held on the tenure of military service, most in Francalmoigne. — Hallam.

Papal family of the time preceding Nicolas V. which boasts its hereditary opulence or magnificent palace, like the Riarios, Farneses, Barberinis, Corsinis, of later times. The Orsinis and Colonnas were Princes created Popes, not descendants of Popes. The vast wealth of the Archbishopric of Milan has shone before us; an Archbishop was the founder of the Ducal House of Visconti. In Italy, however, in general, the Prelates either never possessed or were despoiled of the vast wealth which distinguished the Ultramontane Prelates. Romagna had become the Papal domain; Ravenna had been compelled to yield up her rival territory. The Crusades had not thrown the lands into their hands by the desertion of their lords. In the commercial wealth of Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, they had no share. At Constance, as it has appeared, the Ultramontanes feared that the poverty of the Italian Bishops would place them at the command of the Pope. In Germany the Prince-Archbishops, the Electors, were not scrupulous in extending the wide pale of their ecclesiastical principalities. The grant of estates, of territories, was too common a bribe or a reward from a doubtful aspirant to the Imperial throne. How many fiefs held by Mentz, by Trèves, and by Cologne, dated from the eve of, or from the coronation of an Emperor, raised to the throne after a severe contest! Among the other Prince-Prelates of the Empire, distracted as Germany was for centuries by wars between the Popes and the Emperors, wars between the Emperor and his refractory subjects, their power was perpetually increasing their wealth, their wealth aggrandizing their power. They were too useful allies not to be subsidized by the contending parties; and those subsidies,

being mostly in grants of lands, enhanced the value of their alliance.

In France, the prodigality of the weaker Kings of each race, and each race successively, from the *fainéant* Merovingians, seemed to dwindle down into inevitable weakness, had vied with each other in heaping estates upon the clergy, and in founding and endowing monasteries. If the later Kings, less under strong religious impulses, and under heavier financial embarrassments, were less prodigal; if the mass of secular ecclesiastical property is of earlier date,¹ few reigns passed without the foundation of some religious houses. The Mendicant Orders had their spacious and splendid convents in Paris,² and in the other great cities of France.³

In England the Statute of Mortmain had been the National Protest against the perpetual encroachment of the Church on the landed property of the realm. At

¹ The Abbé Maury, in the debate on the confiscation of church property, asserted that the tenure of some of their estates was older than Clovis. (Lamartine, *Les Constituants*, iii. p. 113.) In the debates on the confiscation of Church property in the National Assembly in 1789, 1790, M. Talleyrand estimated the income of the clergy from tithes at eighty millions of francs, from the lands at seventy millions; total one hundred and fifty millions. This, I presume, did not include the lands, at least not the houses of the monasteries. (Buchon et Roux, *Hist. Parlementaire de la Rév. Française*, iii. p. 156.) In the proposal for the suppression of the religious houses, M. Treilhard declared that four hundred millions might be produced by the sale of the monastic houses, which might be secularized. Those in Paris alone might be sold for one hundred and fifty millions. A calculation was produced, made in 1775, that at 150 livres the toise, they would yield 217,809,000 livres. In another report it was stated that the clergy held one fifth of the net revenue from land in France, amounting to two hundred millions, exclusive of the tithe. (T. v. p. 328.)

² See Dulaure, *Hist. de Paris*, a book with much valuable information, but hostile to the clergy.

³ At the Revolution six Orders had three houses in Paris, some others two. They must have amounted to between forty and fifty.

length the subtlety of the Lawyers baffled the subtlety of the Churchmen; the strong, stern Law could be neither infringed nor eluded. But it left the Church in possession of all which had been heaped at her feet by the prodigal Anglo-Saxon Kings, and the Normans hardly less prodigal. If it had not passed down absolutely undiminished, it had probably on the whole been constantly enlarging its borders; if usurped, or its usufruct, if not the fee, fraudulently made away,¹ it had in many cases widely extended itself by purchase, as well as by donation and bequest.²

There are four periods at which public documents seem at first sight to throw a steady and distinct light on the extent and value of church property in England, its actual if not its relative value. Yet on examination the result of the inquiry becomes dim, confused, and contradictory. It offers no more than a very rude and uncertain approximation to positive conclusions.

I. Domesday-Book gives the lands in the possession of ecclesiastics, as well as lay holders, those of bishops, chapters, churches, monasteries. The first inspection of Domesday may seem to present startling facts. In the whole County of Kent, besides the King (with whom the Churches of St. Martin in Dover and the

¹ Churches were leased to laymen, and without doubt became their actual property; as such were bought and sold.

² The Church bought largely. The statute "*Quia Emptores*" shows abundantly that the possessions of the Church were greatly increased by purchase as well as by donation and bequest. It was a very common practice to purchase an estate in reversion, or to purchase and grant the estate to the former Lord for his life: on his death (*si obire contigerit*) it fell to the Church. Few rich men entered a monastery without bringing some estate or provision with them, which became the inalienable property of the Community. See instances in Taylor's *Index Monasticus*.

Church of Canterbury share those towns), appear as land-owners:—1. The Archbishop of Canterbury; 2. His Monks (Christchurch); 3. The Bishop of Rochester; 4. The Bishop of Bayeux;¹ 5. The Abbey of Battle; 6. St. Augustine's; 7. Abbey of St. Peter's, Ghent. Only four knights, and Albert the Chaplain. In Middlesex are the King, the Archbishop, the Bishop of London, his Canons (of St. Paul's), the Abbot of Westminster, the Abbot of the Holy Trinity in Rouen, the Abbot of Barking, with eighteen others, barons and knights. In Worcestershire the King, the Church of Worcester, the Bishop of Hereford, the Church of St. Denys near Paris, the Church of Cormelies, the Abbeys of Westminster, Pershore, Evesham; the Bishop of Bayeux, the Church of St. Guthlac, the Clerks of Wrehampton, with fifteen laymen. In Berkshire, among sixty-three holders, are the King, five Bishops, among them Durham and Coutances, ten Abbots and Abbesses. In Devonshire, of fifty-three, are the King, two Bishops, Exeter and Coutances, ten abbeys, among them Rouen, Mont St. Michael, St. Stephen and Holy Trinity at Caen. During the reign of our Norman sovereigns these transmarine monasteries held their lands in England. They were either cells or dependent priories which sent their revenues across the sea. As England and France became hostile powers they were gradually seized, till at length, in the time of Henry V., they were confiscated by the strong hand of the law, and vested by Act of Parliament in the Crown.² Our history has dwelt, on more than one

¹ Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, held lands in sixteen counties. — Sir H. Ellis, Introduction.

² Ellis, Introduction to Domesday. Collier, i. p. 650.

occasion, on the estates and benefices held by foreign prelates, chiefly Italians.

II. The valuation made in the reign of Edward I., by order of Pope Nicolas IV. The whole ecclesiastical property was assessed at rather more than 200,000*l.*, a valuation much higher than had been admitted before ; the tenth levied was above 20,000*l.*¹

III. The remarkable petition of the Commons to Henry IV.,² for the confiscation of the whole Church property and its appropriation to the maintenance of a nobility, knighthood, squirehood, burghership, and almshouses, retaining only a priesthood of 15,000, without distinction of Orders, and on the annual stipend of seven marks each. This wild revolutionary scheme estimated the temporalities of the Church at 322,000 marks a year.³ They were thrown together in large masses, each of 20,000, as—1. The see of Canterbury, with the abbeys of Christchurch, St. Augustine, Shrewsbury, Coggleshall, St. Osyth. 2. York (not including Fontaines, Rivaux, and some other abbeys). 3. Six of the larger abbeys, Dover, Battle, Lewes, Coventry, Daventry, and Tournay (Thorney ?) make up another 20,000.⁴ The total estimate of the Church property may seem to have been based on the valuation of Pope Nicolas, the established cataster which had been acted upon for above a century. It is curious,

¹ See vol. vi. p. 253, and note, for the details, A. D. 1292.

² Walsingham, p. 379. Introd. Fox, ii. p. 725, A. D. 1410.

³ That is (calculating a mark at two thirds of a pound, 13*s.* 4*d.*), nearly the same as the Papal valuation.

⁴ Walsingham seems to say that they were set to prove this vast wealth of the clergy, and failed: "*Sed cum niterentur ostendere de quibus locis tam grandes summæ levare possent, unde præmissi dotarentur vel ditarentur, defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio et dum diligunt vanitatem quæssivere mendacium.*"

however, as setting down the annual income necessary to maintain the state of an Earl at 3000 marks; of a Knight at 100, with four plough-lands; an Esquire 40, with two plough-lands. How the poor Priest was to live on his seven marks, unless by the bounty and hospitality of his parishioners — certainly with no hospitality or almsgiving of his own — these early levellers seem not to have thought.¹ About this period, according to another statement, there were in England 46,822 churches, 52,285 villæ, 53,225 military fiefs, of which the ecclesiastics and religious held 28,000. Thus they were in possession of above one half of the knights' fees in the realm.²

IV. The valuation of the whole church property, immediately before the suppression of the larger monasteries,³ as compared with that of Nicolas IV., might be expected to furnish at once a positive and a relative

¹ This concurrence, which is at least approximate, may appear to be of higher authority than the calculation drawn from a passage of Knighton, which would more than double the amount of church property. In the year 1337 two Cardinal Legates came to England. They received for their expenses 50 marks a day, which was raised by four pennies from every benefice, exempt or not exempt. The revenue of the Church would thus amount to 2000 marks a day; multiplied by 365, 730,000 marks; nearly 500,000*l.* Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, i. 519; Hallam. But the Valor of Pope Nicolas was framed by those who wished as much as possible to elude or lighten their taxation.

² This rests on a passage in the Appendix to Hearne's *Avebury*. Mr. Sharon Turner, v. 166, quotes it. Mr. Hallam appears to accept its results, *Middle Ages*, ii. p. 506. Other authorities, quoted in Taylor, p. xxiii., make 60,215 knights' fees; those held by the clergy 23,115. Spelman brings down the proportion to a third; so too Sir W. Temple.

³ Ann. Hen. VIII. 26 A. D. 1534, published by the Record Commission, to be compared with Speed's *Catalogue of Religious Houses, Benefices, &c.* On the revenues of the monasteries, see Dugdale and Stevens, Mr. Nasmith's excellent edition of Tanner's *Notitia*. No book is more instructive than the *Index Monasticus* of the Diocese of Norwich, by Mr. Richd. Taylor, London, 1821.

estimate of the Church possessions. In the Act for the suppression of the smaller monasteries,¹ those with an income under 200*l.* a year, it was supposed that about 380 communities would be dissolved (about 100 then escaped or eluded dissolution), and that the Crown would derive 32,000*l.* of yearly revenue from the confiscation, with 100,000*l.* in plate, jewels, money, and other valuables. After the suppression of the larger monasteries,² the amount of the whole revenue escheated to the Crown was calculated at 161,000*l.*³ A little before this period the revenue of England from lands and possessions had been calculated at 4,000,000*l.*:⁴ the monastic property, therefore, was not more than a twentieth part of the national property. To this must be added the whole Church property that remained, that of the Bishops, Chapters, Colleges, and Parochial Clergy.⁵ The *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of Henry VIII. offers no sum total; but, according to Speed, the whole value was 320,150*l.* 10*s.* If of this, 186,512*l.* 8*s.* 11½*d.* was the gross value of that of the monasteries (the sum escheated to the King, 161,000*l.*), the secular property was about half the whole. Together the two

¹ Burnet, 192, 222. Rymer, xiv. 574. Stevens, Appendix to Dugdale. Lingard, c. iv. Burnet gives 131,607*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* for the larger monasteries, but adds, "*it was at least ten times the sum in true value.*"

² Lord Herbert; Speed; Hume, c. 81.

³ It is singular that these two sums amount to near 200,000*l.* The whole property of the Church, according to the valuation of Nicolas IV., stood at about 204,000*l.*, so that the value of Monastic property was then near that of the whole Church property under Edward I.

⁴ This is stated by Hume, and on such a subject Hume was likely to be accurate, but he does not give his authority.

⁵ One insulated point of comparison has offered itself. According to the *Valor* of Nicolas, Christ Church, Canterbury, was assessed at 355*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.*, under Henry VIII. at 2,349*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*, an increase of about seven times.

sums would amount to a tenth of the revenue of the kingdom as estimated by Hume.¹

But this estimate is very fallacious,² both as to the extent and the actual value³ of the Church property. As to the extent, in London and the neighboring counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Essex, the Church lands, or at least the lands in which the Church had some tenure, must have been enormous. Hardly a parish in Middlesex did not belong, certainly so far as manorial rights, to the Bishop of London, the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, the Abbot and monks of Westminster, and other religious houses—the Carthusians, St. John's Clerkenwell (the Hospitallers), Sion, and many smaller foundations. The Chapter of St. Paul's swept in a broad belt round the north of London till they met the Church of Westminster at Hampstead and Padding-

¹ When, by Bishop Burnet's advice (Burnet's Own Times, edit. Oxford, v. p. 118), the First-Fruits and Tenths were made over to the Board, called Queen Anne's Bounty, the tenths were reckoned at 11,000*l.*, which has now remained unaltered, according to the valuation of Henry VIII. This would make the property 111,000*l.* Speed gives 111,207*l.* 14*s.* 2*d.*, but a certain portion had been appropriated to the Bishops and Chapters, which makes up the total.

² Some of the richer monasteries had sunk to a small oligarchy. Chertsey with 14 monks, had 740*l.* a year; Furness, with 30, 966*l.* It is curious to compare Hume and Lingard. Both select Furness as their example (Hume puts Furness in Lincolnshire). Hume gives the small number of monks as compared with the great income; on the signal iniquity of the mode in which the suppression was enforced he is silent. Lingard is coldly eloquent, as is his wont, on the iniquity—of the small number of monks not a word.

³ On the important question of the relative value of money at that time and the present, taking in the joint consideration of weight of silver and price of provisions, Mr. Taylor, in 1821, would multiply by 15 times. Land in Norfolk let from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* an acre; wages for a haymaker were, during Henry VII. and Henry VIII., 1*d.* to 1*d.* a day. The whole ecclesiastical revenues in the diocese of Norwich would be worth 510,000*l.* a year.

ton.¹ The Abbot of Westminster was almost a prince of Westminster.²

On the other hand, the estates and manors of the Church and of the monasteries, though, as probably having been the longest under cultivation, the best cultivated, in productive value were far below their imagined wealth. The Church was by usage, perhaps from interest, an indulgent landlord. Of the estates, a large part had become copyhold, and paid only a moderate quit-rent, and a small fixed fine on renewal. Of those on which the Church reserved the full fee, the fines on renewals, whether on lives or for terms of years, were no doubt extremely moderate. They had become hereditary in families, and acquired the certainty of actual possession. The rents were paid in money, usually of small amount, in services to the landlord (the Prebendary or the Church), in the cultivation of their lands, and to a considerable extent in kind. Probably the latter contribution was not taken into the account of their value. But not only had each monastery its common refectory, each Chapter had its common establishment, its common table, its horses, and other conveniences, largely supplied by the growers; hay and straw, beasts, poultry furnished at specified times by the tenants. Each had its mill, its brewhouse, its bakery; and no doubt the annual expenses of the House, or Domus, were to a large extent supplied from these un-

¹ Archdeacon Hale has printed, not yet published (for the Camden Society), what he calls the Domesday of St. Paul; the Visitation of the manors of the Dean and Chapter (not the separate estates of the prebendaries). It throws great light on this point, as well as on the tenure and condition of the Church property.

² At the Dissolution, Westminster was the most wealthy monastery — it was estimated at 8977*l.*; St. John's, Clerkenwell, the richest of the military orders, 2385*l.*; Sion, the richest nunnery, 1944*l.* — Speed.

reckoned sources.¹ Yet on the whole the tenants, no doubt, of the Church shared a full portion of the wealth of the Church, so secure and easy was their tenure; and it was not uncommon for ecclesiastics to take beneficiary leases of the lands of their own Church, which they bequeathed as property to their kindred or heirs, not infrequently to their children. Besides this, over all their property the Church had a host of officers and retainers, stewards of their courts, receivers, proctors, lawyers, and other dependents, numberless in name and function.

But of the wealth of the Clergy, the landed property, even with the tithe, was by no means the whole; and, invaded as it was by aggression, by dilapidation, by alienation through fraud or violence, limited in its productiveness by usage, by burdens, by generosity, by maladministration, it may be questioned whether it was the largest part. The vast treasures accumulated by the Avignonese Pontiffs when the Papal territories were occupied by enemies or adventurers, and could have yielded but scanty revenues, testify to the voluntary or compulsory tribute paid by Western Christendom to her Supreme Court of Appeal. If the Bishops

¹ All this throws light on a very curious state of things at St. Paul's; no doubt not peculiar to St. Paul's. The Chapter consisted of 30 Prebendaries, each with his separate estate, and originally his right to share in the common fund, on condition of performing certain services in the Church. The Prebendaries withdrew each to the care and enjoyment of his Prebend, or, if a Pluralist, of many Prebends, leaving the duties to be performed by certain Residentiaries; so when the daily mass, the perpetual office was imposed as a burden, it was difficult to keep up the number of Residentiaries. In process of time the Common Fund grew larger, the emoluments and advantages from oblations, obits, and other sources increased in value; there was then a strife and a press to become a Residentiary. It was necessary (the exhausted fund was the plea) to obtain Papal or Archiepiscopal decrees to limit the number of Residentiaries.

mainly depended on their endowments, to the Clergy, to the monastic churches, oblations (in many cases now from free gifts hardened into rightful demands) were pouring in, and had long been pouring in, with incalculable profusion. Not only might not the altars, hardly any part of the church might be approached without a votive gift. The whole life, the death of every Christian was bound up with the ceremonial of the Church ; for almost every office, was received from the rich and generous the ampler donation, from the poorer or more parsimonious was exacted the hard-wrung fee. Above all, there were the masses, which might lighten the sufferings of the soul in purgatory ; there was the prodigal gift of the dying man out of selfish love for himself ;¹ the more generous and no less prodigal gift of the bereaved, out of holy charity for others. The dying man, from the King to the peasant, when he had no further use for his worldly riches would devote them to this end ;² the living, out of profound respect or deep affection for the beloved husband, parent, brother, kinsman, friend, would be, and actually was, not less bountiful and munificent.³ Add to all

¹ I am able to illustrate this from the records of St. Paul's, which have been investigated with singular industry and accuracy by my friend Archdeacon Hale, to whom I am indebted for much valuable information.

² There is another curious illustration of the wealth of the Clergy. The inventory of the effects of Richard Gravesend, Bishop of London, from 1290 to 1303. It measures 28 feet in length : it gives in detail all his possessions, his chapel (plate of the chapel), jewels, robes, books, horses, the grain and stock on each of his manors, with the value of each. The total amounts to 2871*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.* Corn was then 4*s.* per quarter.

³ We have in St. Paul's an account of the obits or anniversaries of the deaths of certain persons, for the celebration of which bequests had been made in the fourteenth century. The number was 111. The payments made amounted in the whole to 2678*s.* 5*d.*, of which the Dean and Canons Residentiary (present) received 1461*s.*, about 73*l.* ; multiply by 15, to bring to present value, 1075*l.*

this the oblations at the crosses of the Redeemer, or the shrines of popular and famous saints, for their intercessory prayers to avert the imminent calamity, to assuage the sorrow, or to grant success to the schemes, it might be, of ambition, avarice, or any other passion, to obtain pardon for sin, to bring down blessing: crosses and shrines, many of them supposed to be endowed with miraculous powers, constantly working miracles.¹ To most of these were made perpetual processions, led by the Clergy in their rich attire. From the basins of gold or the bright florins of the King to the mite of the beggar, all fell into the deep, insatiable box, which unlocked its treasures to the Clergy.²

Besides all these estates, tithes, oblations, bequests to the Clergy and the monasteries, reckon the subsidies in

¹ E. g., Richard Preston, citizen and grocer, gave to the shrine of St. Erkenwald his best sapphire stone, for curing of infirmities of the eyes, appointing that proclamation should be made of its virtues. — Dugdale, p. 21.

² We have an account of the money found in the box under the great Cross on the entrance of the Cathedral (*Recepta de pixide Crucis Borealis*). In one month (May, A. D. 1344) it yielded no less than 50*l.* (*præter argentum fractum*). This was more than an average profit, but taken as an average it gives 600*l.* per annum. Multiply this by 15 to bring it to the present value of money, 9000*l.* This, by an order of the Pope's Commissary, A. D. 1410 (Dugdale, p. 20), was divided among the Dean and Canons Residentiary. But this was by no means the only box of offerings — perhaps not the richest. There was one at the magnificent shrine of St. Erkenwald; another at that of the Virgin, before which the offerings of wax tapers alone were so valuable, that the Dean and Chapter would no longer leave them to the vergers and servants of the Church. They were extinguished, carried to a room behind the chapter-house, and melted, for the use of the said Dean and Canons. Archbishop Arundel assigned to the same Dean and Canons, and to their successors forever, the whole profits of the oblation box. Dugdale recounts gifts by King John of France, especially to the shrine of St. Erkenwald. The shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury received in one year 832*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*; in another, 954*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.* — Burnet, *Hist. Reformat.*, vol. i. See Taylor, *Index* for our Lady of Walsingham. Our Chantry accounts are full and well preserved, and would furnish a very curious illustration of the office and income of the Mass Priest.

kind to the Mendicants in their four Orders — Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, Carmelites. In every country of Latin Christendom, of these swarms of Friars, the lowest obtained sustenance: the higher means to build and to maintain splendid churches, cloisters, houses. All of these, according to their proper theory, ought to have lived on the daily dole from the charitable, bestowed at the gate of the palace or castle, of the cottage or hovel. But that which was once an act of charity had become an obligation. Who would dare to repel a holy Mendicant? The wealth of the Mendicants was now an object of bitter jealousy to the Clergy and to the older monastic Orders. They were a vast standing army, far more vast than any maintained by any kingdom in Christendom, at once levying subsidies to an enormous amount, and living at free quarters throughout the land. How onerous, how odious they had become in England, may be seen in the prose of Wycliffe and in the poetry of Piers Ploughman.¹

The Clergy, including the Monks and Friars, were one throughout Latin Christendom; and through them, to a great extent, the Latin Church was one. Unity of the clergy. Whatever antagonism, feud, hatred, estrangement, might rise between rival Prelates, rival Priests, rival Orders — whatever irreconcilable jealousy there might be between the Seculars and Regulars — yet the Caste seldom, and but on rare occasions, betrayed the interest of the Caste. The high-minded Churchman,

¹ Later, Speed, from the Supplication of Beggars, asserts, as demonstrated, that, reckoning that every householder paid the five Orders five-pence a year only, the sum of 43,000*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* was paid them by the year, besides the revenues of their own lands.

who regarded his country more than the Church, was not common ; the renegade, who pursued his private interests by sacrificing those of his Order, might be more so ; but he stood alone a hated and despised apostate. There might be many traitors from passion, ignorance, obstinacy, blindness to its interests — few premeditated and deliberate deserters of its cause. The Clergy in general (there were noble exceptions) were first the subjects of the Pope, then the subjects of the temporal Sovereign. The Papal Legate, the Proconsul of the Pope, the co-Ruler with the King, was not dependent on the reception of a cold perhaps or hostile Court ; he could almost command, rarely did not receive, the unlimited homage of the Clergy : to him was due their first obedience. The Pope claimed and long maintained the sole right of taxation of ecclesiastical property ; only under his authority could that property be assessed by the State. This general taxation by the Pope began during the Crusades, for that holy purpose ; it was continued for all other Crusades which he might command, and was extended to his general uses ; he condescended from time to time to throw some part, in his bounty, to the temporal Sovereign ;¹ but, in theory, the right was in him and in him alone. It was asserted over the whole of Christendom, and made him, as the guardian, so in some respects the Suzerain of Church property throughout the world. The allegiance of the hierarchy to the Church was at once compulsory and voluntary ; the Pope's awful powers held in check the constant inevitable tendency

¹ It is curious to see the words "*caritativum subsidium*" creep into the more weak demands of the Popes during the schism. — MS., B. M. *passim* at that period.

to rebellion and contumacy, which was usually that of individual Prelates or small factions. Among themselves the Clergy could not but at times split into parties on temporal or religious subjects; but if the Papal or hierarchical authority lost ground by their turbulence or their divisions, they were soon driven back to an unanimity of dependence on the Papal power by the encroachments of the State, or to settle their own disputes. They fled from ruder tyrants to the throne of St. Peter; the Pope was at least a more impartial judge than their rival or antagonist — mostly than the civil ruler. On the whole the Order of the Clergy was one from the utmost East to the farther West, from the North to the South.

The universal fraternity of the Monastic Orders and of the Friars was even more intimate. Everywhere, from the Scottish islands to the Spanish frontier of Christendom, the Benedictine, the Clugniac, the Cistercian, might find a home; the abbey of his brethren opened to him its hospitable doors. This was of less importance to the elder and more sedentary Orders (they, too, travelled, a few in search of learning — most who did leave their homes, as pilgrims to Rome, to other famous shrines, or to the East): but to the wandering Friars, who spread all over Europe, of what incalculable advantage to find everywhere brethren connected with them by a closer, as they thought a holier tie, than that of kindred or consanguinity; a ready auditory prepared by the tertiaries of the Order; allies in their invasion on the parishes of the secular priests; a crowd of admirers of their learning, which added fame and so strength to their Order, and of their zeal or eloquence, which brought in new proselytes; abet-

tors and maintainers of their influence, which was still wringing further wealth for the Order from the timid living or the remorseful dying man. This all-comprehending fraternization had the power, and some of the mystery, without the suspicion and hatred which attaches to secret societies. It was a perpetual campaign, set in motion and still moving on with simultaneous impulse from one or from several centres, but with a single aim and object, the aggrandizement of the Society, with all its results for evil or for good.

The Clergy had their common language throughout Western Christendom. In their intercourse with each other they needed no interpreter. This was far more than their bond ; it was among the most lasting guarantees of their power. It was not from their intellectual superiority alone, but from their almost exclusive possession of the universal European language, that they held and retained the administration of public affairs. No royal Embassy was without its Prelate, even if the Ambassadors were not all Prelates, for they only could converse freely together without mutual misunderstanding of their barbarous jargon, or the precarious aid of an interpreter. The Latin alone was as yet sufficiently precise and definite in its terms to form binding treaties ; it was the one language current throughout Europe ; it was of necessity that of all negotiations between distant kingdoms.

Hence, too, in some respects, the Churchman was of all countries. His knowledge, at least the knowledge of the Churchman who moved beyond the bounds of his narrow parish, of the universal Latin — the ability (in theory possessed by all) to officiate in the unchangeable service of the Church — was the only indispensa-

ble qualification for any dignity or benefice throughout Christendom. Latin Christianity had invaded the East, and planted Latin Bishops to celebrate Latin services almost throughout the Byzantine Empire. German Popes, French Popes, one English Pope, a Portuguese, a Greek or Calabrese Antipope, have occupied or have aspired to the throne of St. Peter: none of them were foreigners in tongue. All Christendom, especially England, saw their richest benefices held by strangers,¹ ignorant of the native language, and these did not always hold their remote cures as honors and appendages to their Italian dignities, but visited them at least occasionally, and had no difficulty in going through the routine of religious service.² There might be bitter complaints of the imperfect fulfilment of duty: conscientious men might refuse preferment among a people of strange language; but there was no legal or canonical disqualification; all that could be absolutely demanded was the ability to recite or chant the Latin breviary; no clergyman was a stranger or foreigner among the Clergy in any European kingdom.

That ubiquity of the Clergy, as belonging to one Order, under one head, under one law and discipline, speaking a common language, to a certain extent with common habits of life, was of inestimable importance, as holding together the great commonwealth of European nations, in antagonism to the Eastern races, aggregated into one horde by the common bond of the Koran. Had the Christian kingdoms grown up separate, isolated, ad-

¹ I have noticed (vol. v. p. 316) the pluralist who held the archdeaconry of Thessalonica with benefices in Norfolk.

² Michael Scott is a rare instance of scrupulousness in refusing the Archbishopric of Cashel, on account of his ignorance of Irish. The objection does not seem to have occurred to his patron the Pope.

verse, even if each with its independent national hierarchy, still with hardly any communication but by the war of neighboring States with neighboring States, and with commerce restricted, precarious, unenterprising, there must have been either one vast Asiatic despotism, founded by some mighty conqueror — a Charlemagne, without his sagacious religious as well as civil organization — or a disruption into hard repulsive masses, a shifting and conflicting aggregate of savage tribes. There could have been no confederacy to oppose the mighty invading league of Mohammedanism. Christendom could only have a religious Capital, and that Capital in all the early period was Rome; to Rome there was a constant ebb and flow from the remotest borders of Europe, and this chiefly of the Clergy; through them, knowledge, arts, whatsoever remained of the older civilization, circulated to the extremities. The Legate, the Nuncio, if he came to bow kings and nations to an imperious yoke and to levy tribute, brought with him the peaceful pomp, the courtly manners, the knowledge, the refinement of the South; his inalienable character was that of an emissary of peace; he had no armed retainers; he found his retainers, except the few who accompanied him, in the land which he visited — the Clergy. He might, as he too often did, belie his character of the Angel of Peace;¹ he might inflame civil wars, he might even set up rebellious sons against fathers, but his ostensible office was always moderation: his progress through interjacent realms, where he passed safe, respected, honored by the deferential veneration of all the hierarchy, was an homage to the representa-

¹ This is the title perpetually introduced into the instructions and powers given to the Cardinal or other Legates.

tive of one whose office at least was to promote peace ; it was an universal recognition of the blessings, the sanctity of peace. However the acts of Popes, of worldly or martial Prelates, or of a rude or fierce Clergy, might be at issue with the primal principles of the faith, yet, at the same time that they practised this wide apostasy, they condemned their own apostasy ; their language could not entirely throw off, far from throwing off, it dwelt ostentatiously, though against themselves, on the true and proper aim of their interference. Where war was the universal occupation, though swept away by the torrent, they were constantly lifting up their voice against war, at least against war of Christian against Christian ; they would divert the whole martial impulses of Christendom against the Mohammedan. Thus for centuries, through the length and breadth of Latin Christendom, was propagated and maintained, even by those who were constantly violating and weakening their own precepts, a sympathy for better and more Christian tenets — a faint yet undying echo of the angelic annunciation of Christianity, appealing to the whole Christian priesthood, and through the priesthood to universal man ; “peace on earth, good-will to men.” Through the Hierarchy Christian Europe was one ; and Christian Europe was at least brooding over the seeds of a richer harvest ; it was preparing for a generous rivalry in laws, letters, arts, even in religion.

Another result of the ubiquitous Hierarchical influence, though not so much a result of its ubiquity as of its inalienable character, must not ^{Effects on social rank.} be passed by. It was not only a bond which held together the Christian nations, of different races and of

different tongues, but in every nation of the Christian commonwealth the Clergy, and the Clergy alone, held together the different ranks and classes. The old Roman prejudice of the ineffaceable distinction between the free man and the slave lurked in the minds of the aristocratic Hierarchy of the South. The Clergy could not but be deeply impregnated with the feudal respect for high birth,¹ but they could not efface from the record of the faith, from the older traditions, to do them justice they never lost sight of, the saying of the Saviour, that the poor were their especial charge; poverty was, as it were, consecrated by the humble lives of the Lord and his Apostles. Many Popes have been seen rising from the meanest parentage to the Pontifical throne. In every kingdom some of the highest examples of Christian piety and ability, canonized Saints,

¹ In the Papal dispensations we constantly find "*nobilitas generis*" spoken of with "*scientia et honestas*;" as a justification of the permission to hold benefices in plurality. — MS., B. M. *passim*.

I select one illustration as in every way remarkable, not the less as proceeding from Nicolas V. It is an answer to a petition from George Neville, Canon of York, son of his beloved son Richard Earl of Salisbury. "The nobility of his descent (he was even, as he said, of royal lineage) induced the Pope to grant him a dispensation (he being fourteen years old) to hold a canonry in the Church of Salisbury, with one in York. Moreover, the gracious favor of the Pope (*tuorum intuitu meritorum*), the merit of a boy of fourteen! allowed him to hold those or any other two incompatible benefices, with or without cure of souls; even Parish Churches, or any dignities, below the highest; to hold them together, or to exchange them at his will during his whole life (*quoad vixeris*). The provision must be added, that the benefices were to be properly served, and the cure of souls not neglected." — Rome, A. D. 1447, July 7.

At twenty-three years old the same George Neville was appointed Bishop of Exeter; as he could not be consecrated for four years, he had a Bull to receive the profits. — Collier, i. 674. He was afterwards Archbishop of York. See Collier, 682. I would add on pluralities that, though not noble, Wykeham, before he was Bishop, held the archdeaconry of Buckingham the Provostship of Wells, twelve other prebends or canonries, *sacerdotiaque cum curâ plus quam satis*. — Godwin, p. 286.

were constantly drawn up from the humblest of mankind. Once a Churchman, the hallowed man took his position from his ecclesiastical rank, not from his birth or descent; that higher nobility had cancelled all the want of noble ancestry. There might be at some periods a closer brotherhood — a kind of separate corporate spirit — between ecclesiastics of high or generous lineage, but it rarely dared to be exclusive; other qualities, either worldly or religious, were allowed to dress the balance. The Bishop with royal blood in his veins was no more a Bishop than he who had sprung from the dregs of the people; he wore the same dress; according to his possessions, might display the same pomp; was often not less proud in the cathedral; not only in the cathedral, even in the royal Council he occupied the same seat; had almost as fair a chance of canonization. The power of overleaping the line, which lay so broad and deep, between the high and low, the noble and the peasant, the lord and the serf, must have been a perpetual consolation and hope in the conscious abasement of the poor man and of the serf — a drop of sweetness in his bitter cup.

This, indeed, could be but the lot of few; and there might in the lower orders be much envy and jealousy of those who rose from their ranks to the height of Churchmanly dignity, as well as pride and emulation to vie with their success. Men do not always love or honor those who have outstripped them in the race of fortune or distinction; but, whether objects of envy or of encouragement, these were but rare: and most, no doubt, of the humbler classes who were admitted into the Hierarchy rose no higher than the meanest functions, or the privilege of becoming Holy Mendicants.

But, in the darkest periods, when all other Christian virtues were nearly extinct, charity, in its form of almsgiving, survived, and was strong; and, indeed, in institutions for the poor, hospitals, leper-houses, charity was not only recognized as a duty especially incumbent on Churchmen; it was a duty ostentatiously discharged. The haughtiest Pope condescended to imitate the Lord in washing the feet of poor men. Many of the most worldly Prelates were the most munificent; perhaps satisfied their consciences in the acquisition of unapostolic pomp and wealth by applying it to apostolic uses. The donation, the bequest, prodigally bestowed or ungraciously yielded by the remorseful sinner to the Priest or Bishop, as it was made to God and his Poor, however much of it might linger in the hands of the Clergy, and be applied to less hallowed purposes, nevertheless did not all lose its way; part of it strayed to its proper object — the assuagement of human indigence and misery. This was especially the case with the monastic establishments: it has been said that they were the poor-houses of the Middle Ages; but if poor-houses, like our own by no means wisely or providently administered, still they had those twofold blessings of acts of mercy — some softening of the heart of him who gave, some consolation to the victim, in those days probably more often of the hard times, than of his own improvidence. Latin Christianity may point to still surviving Foundations for the good — the temporal, the intellectual good — of mankind; her Hospitals and her Brotherhoods, her Universities and her Schools, her Churches and her Missions, in large part owing to the munificence or the active agency of her universal Hierarchy; and may thus calmly and securely appeal to

the sentence of the most enlightened Christianity which will ever, as it may be hoped, prevail in the world.

And if the Hierarchy drew too imperiously, too sternly, too deeply the line of demarcation ^{Equality of mankind.} between the hallowed and unhallowed castes of mankind, it had the inestimable merit of asserting the absolute spiritual equality of all not in sacred orders. On the floor of the Church, before the Priest, before God (however there might be some and not always unwise distinction in place and in the homage to rank), the King and the Serf, in all essential points, stood on the same level. The same Sacraments were the common right of all. They were baptized in the same font, heard the same masses, might listen to the same sermons, were married by the same rites, knelt at the same altar, before the throne of the same Saint, received the body and blood of the same Redeemer, were even buried (though with very different pomp of funeral) in ground equally consecrated. The only distinction was excommunication or non-excommunication. The only outlaw was, it was believed, self-outlawed by wandering beyond the pale of the Church. The faithful were one people. Who shall estimate the value, the influence, the blessing of this perpetual assertion, this visible manifestation, of the only true Christian doctrine of equality — equality before God?

One subject we would willingly decline, but the historian must not shrink from truth, however repulsive. Celibacy, which was the vital energy of the Clergy, was at the same time their fatal, irremediable weakness. One half, at least a large portion, of humankind could not cease to be humankind. The universal voice, which arraigns the state of morals, as regards

sexual intercourse, among the Clergy, is not that of their enemies only, it is their own. Century after century we have heard throughout our history the eternal protest of the severer Churchmen, of Popes, of Legates, of Councils. The marriage, or, as it was termed, the concubinage, of the Clergy was the least evil. The example set in high places (to deny the dissoluteness of the Papal Court at Avignon, would be to discard all historical evidence) could not be without frightful influence. The Avignonese Legates bore with them the morals of Avignon. The last strong effort to break the bonds of celibacy at the council of Basle warned but warned in vain. It is the solemn attestation to the state of Germany and the northern kingdoms.¹ Even in his own age, no doubt, Henry Bishop of Liege was a monster of depravity. The frightful revelation of his life is from an admonitory letter of the wise and good Pope Gregory X. His lust was promiscuous. He kept as his concubine a Benedictine Abbess. He had boasted in a public banquet that in twenty-two months he had had fourteen children born. This was not the worst — there was foul incest, and with nuns. But the most extraordinary part of the whole is that in the letter the Pope seems to contemplate only the repentance of the Prelate, which he urges with the most fervent solemnity. Henry's own prayers, and the intercessory prayers of the virtuous — some such, no doubt, there must be in Liege — are to work the change; and then he is to administer his Pontifical

¹ See vol. vii. p. 562. Before the Council of Trent, the Elector of Bavaria declared in a public document, that of 50 Clergy very few were not concubinarij. — Sarpi, viii. vii p. 414. See for Italy references to Justiniani, Patriarch of Venice; St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence; Weissenberg, *Kirchen Versammlungen*, ii. p. 229; again for Germany, ii. p. 228.

office, so as to be a model of holiness, as he had been of vice, to his subjects. As to suspension, degradation, deposition, there is not a word. The Pope's lenity may have been meant to lure him to the Council of Lyons, where he was persuaded to abdicate his Sec.¹ Hardly less repulsive, in some respects more so, as it embraces the Clergy and some of the convents of a whole province, is the disclosure, as undeniable and authentic, of sacerdotal morals, in the Register of the Visitations of Eudes Rigaud, Archbishop of Rouen, from 1248 to 1269.² We must suppose that only the Clergy of notorious and detected incontinence were presented at the Visitation. The number is sufficiently appalling: probably it comprehends, without much distinction, the married and concubinarian, as well as looser Clergy. There is one convent of females, which might almost have put Boccaccio to the blush. I am bound to confess that the Records of the Visitations from St. Paul's, some of which have been published not without reserve, too fully vindicate the truth of Langland, Chaucer, and the Satirists against the English Clergy and Friars in the fourteenth century.³ And

¹ "Circa divinum quoque et pontificale officium sic te sedulum et devotum exhibere" "Subditi." Henry of Liege was of princely race, of the house of Gueldres, Cousin - German to the Priest - Emperor, William of Holland: he became Bishop when a mere boy. Concilia sub ann. 1274. Hocsemius, Vit. Episcop. Leodens. p. 299.

² Registrum Archep. Rotomagensium, published by M. Bonnin, Rouen, 1846. It is full of other curious and less unedifying matter.

³ Precedents in Criminal Causes edited by Archdeacon Hale, London, 1847. There is enough in these, the Visitations themselves make matters worse. It is curious that much earlier under the reign of K. Stephen the Dean Ralph de Diceto speaks of the "focarizæ," of the canons. Mr. Froude has published from the Records (in Fraser's Magazine, Feb. 1857) the visitation of a later time, of Archbishop Morton. The great Abbey of St. Alban's was in a state which hardly bears description.

these Visitations, which take note only of those publicly accused, hardly reached, if they did reach, the lowest and the loosest. Only some of the Monks, none of the Wandering Friars, were amenable to Episcopal or Archidiaconal jurisdiction. Whether we call it by the holier name of marriage, or the more odious one of concubinage, this, the weakness or the sin of the Clergy, could not be committed by the Monks and Friars. They, mostly with less education and less discipline, spread abroad through the world, had far greater temptations, more fatal opportunities. Though they had, no doubt, their Saints, not only Saints, but numberless nameless recluses of admirable piety, unimpeachable holiness, fervent love of God and of man, yet of the profound corruption of this class there can be no doubt. But Latin, Roman Christianity, would not, could not, surrender this palladium of her power.¹

Time and the vicissitudes in political affairs had made a great difference in the power of the Clergy in the principal kingdoms of Europe. In Italy, in his double character of Italian potentate and as the Pontiff of Christendom, the Pope, after the discomfiture of the Council of Basle, had resumed in great measure his ascendancy. He now aspired to reign supreme over Letters and Arts. But from this time, or from the close of this century, the Italian Potentate, as has been

¹ The Roman view is thus given in an argument before the Pope by the Cardinal de Carpi. "Del matrimonio de' Preti ne seguirà che avendo casa, moglie, figli, non dipenderanno del Papa, ma del suo Principe, e la carità della prole gli farà condescendere ad ogni pregiudizio della Chiesa; cercaranno anco di far i benefici ereditari, ed in brevissimo spatio la Sede Apostolica si restringerà a Roma. Innanzi che fosse istituito il celibato non cavava frutto alcuno la Sede Romana dell' altre città e regioni; per quello e fatta padrona de tanti benefizi, di quali il matrimonio il privarebbe in breve tempo." — Sarpi, L. v. Opere, v. ii. p. 77.

said, began to predominate over the Pope. The successor of St. Peter was either chosen from one of the great Italian families, or aspired to found a great family. Nepotism became at once the strength and the infirmity, the glory and the shame, of the Papacy: the strength, as converting the Popes into the highest rank of Italian princes; the weakness, as inducing them to sacrifice the interests of the Holy See to the promotion of their own kindred: the glory, as seeing their descendants holding the highest offices, occupying splendid palaces, possessors of vast estates, sovereigns of principalities; the shame, as showing too often a feeble fondness for unworthy relatives, and entailing on themselves some complicity in the guilt, the profligacy or wickedness of their favored kindred.

While the Pope thus rose, the higher Prelates of Italy seemed to sink, with no loss, perhaps, Italy. of real dignity, into their proper sphere. The Archbishops of Milan, Florence, Genoa, Ravenna, are obscured before the Viscontis and Sforzas, the Medicis and Dorias, the hereditary Sovereigns, the princely Condottieri, the republican Podestàs, or the Dukes. Venice adhered to her ancient jealous policy; she would have no ambitious, certainly no foreign, Prelate within her lagoons. She was for some time content to belong to the province of an Archbishop hardly within her territory; and that Archbishop, if not a stranger within her walls, had no share in Venetian power or wealth. The single Bishop in Venice was Bishop of one of the small islands, Castello. Venice was first erected, and submitted to be erected, into a patriarchate by Nicolas V.¹ When she admitted a Bishop or a

¹ Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*.

Patriarch (perhaps because no one of inferior dignity must appear in St. Mark's), that Bishop received his investiture of his temporal possessions, his ring and pastoral staff, from the Doge. No Synods could be held without permission of the Council. It was not till after her humiliation by the League of Cambray that Venice would admit the collation of Bishops to sees within her territories ; even then they must be native Venetians. The Superiors of the Monasteries and Orders were Venetians. Even Papal vacancies were presented to by the Venetian Cardinals. The Republic maintained and exercised the right of censure on Venetian Bishops and on Cardinals. If they were absent or contumacious their offences were visited on their families ; they were exiled, degraded, banished. The parish priests were nominated by the proprietors in the parish. There was a distinct, severe, inflexible prohibition to the Clergy of all Orders to intermeddle in political affairs. Thus did Venice insulate herself in her haughty independence of Papal as of all other powers.¹ Paolo Sarpi could write, without fear of the fulminations of Rome : he had only to guard against the dagger of the papalizing fanatic. There was a complete, universal toleration for foreign rites ; Greek, Armenian, and Mohammedan were under protection. Prosecutions for heresy were discouraged.

Ravenna had long ceased to be the rival of Rome ; the Malatestas, not the Archbishop, were her Lords. The younger branches of the great princely families, those who were disposed to ease, lettered affluence, and more peaceful pomp, by no means disdained the lofty

¹ Daru, *Hist. de Venise*, L. xxviii. c. xi. The saying — *Siamo Venetiani, poi Christiani* — was their boast or their reproach.

titles, the dignity, the splendid and wealthy palaces of the Prelature: some aspired to the Popedom. Those too, and they were by no means wanting, who were possessed with a profound sense of religion, rose, from better motives and with the noblest results, to the honors of the Church. The Roman Colonnas, the Venetian Contarinis, the Lombard Borromeos, some of the holiest men, were of famous or Papal houses. The Medicis gave two Popes, Leo X. and Clement VII., princes rather than Saints, to the throne of St. Peter. Few Prelates, however, if any, excepting Popes, founded princely families. The Republics, the Tyrants who overthrew or undermined the Republics, the great Transalpine powers which warred for the mastery of Italy, warred by temporal arms alone. No Prelates took the field or plunged into politics, except the Pope and his Cardinals; even from them excommunications had lost their power. They warred with the ordinary instruments of war, soldiers, lances, and artillery. Every other Prelate was content if he could enjoy his revenues and administer his diocese in peace. In general, even the least religious had learned the wisdom or necessity of decency; the more accomplished indulged in the patronage of letters and arts, often letters and arts Pagan rather than Christian; the truly religious rarely wrought their religion to fanaticism; they shone with the light of the milder virtues, and spent their superfluous wealth on churches and on ecclesiastical objects. Christian Art had its papal, its prelati- cal, its monastic impulses.

In France the Pragmatic Sanction, not repealed till the reign of Francis I., left the disposal of the *France*. great preferments in the power of the Crown. But, as

has been said, the Pragmatic Sanction was no bold assertion of religious freedom, no generous effort for the emancipation of the universal Church. The Gallican liberties were throughout a narrow, national claim to a special and peculiar exemption from that which was acknowledged to be elsewhere an unlimited autocracy. The claim rested on its own grounds, was more endeared to France because it was distinctive; it was a perpetual appeal to the national vanity, the vindication of a privilege of which men are more fond than of a common right. As an exceptional case, though in direct contradiction with its first principle, it affirmed in all other countries the plenary indispensable power of the Pope.¹

The civil wars of the Armagnacs and the Burgundians, the wars with England, threw the hierarchy of France, as it were, into the shade; more violent impulses agitated the realm than struggles for power between the Church and State.² The Churchmen were divided in these fatal quarrels: like the nobles of France, there were Orleanist and Burgundian Bishops. The King of England named Bishops, he had Bishops for his unscrupulous partisans, in the conquered provinces of France. It was the Bishop of Beauvais — with the Inquisitors of France — who condemned Joan of Arc as a witch, and burned her at the stake. In this wicked, contemptible, and hateful process the

¹ Gioberti has somewhere declared the Gallican Liberties a standing Antipope.

² The Parliament of Poitiers compelled Charles VII. to renounce an ordinance, Feb. 14, 1424, which they refused to register, restoring to the Pope the nomination to the Benefices. This weak concession had been obtained from the King by the Queen of Sicily. The Parliament declared the ordinance surreptitious, and contrary to the rights of the Bishops. — *Ordonnances des Rois*, Preface, t. xiii. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xiii. 54.

Church must share the guilt with England. High feudal names during all this period are found in the hierarchy of France, but the rich prelacies and abbas had not yet become to such an extent as hereafter the appanages of the younger branches of the noble families. So long as the King possessed the inappreciable prerogative of rewarding the faithful, or purchasing the wavering loyalty of those dangerous, once almost coequal, subjects by the bestowal of benefices, this power had no inconsiderable influence on the growth of the royal authority. At all events, the Church offered no resistance to the consolidation of the kingly power; the ecclesiastical nobles were mostly the obsequious partisans of the Crown.

In Spain the Church had not begun to rule her Kings with absolute sway, or rather her *Spain*. Kings had not yet become in mind and heart Churchmen. The Crusade still continued against the Mohammedan, who was slowly and stubbornly receding before the separate kingdoms, Castile, Arragon, Portugal. Spain had not yet begun — might seem unlikely to begin — her crusade against the rising religious liberties of Europe. She aspired not to be the Champion, and, as the Champion, the Sovereign of Latin Christendom; she had given to the Church St. Dominic, she had yet to give Ximenes, Philip II., Torquemada, Loyola.

In Germany the strife of the Papacy and the Empire seemed altogether worn out; the Emperor *Germany*. was content to be a German Sovereign, the Pope to leave the German sovereignty to the German Electors. The Concordat and the Articles of Aschaffenburg had established a truce which might settle down into peace. If the Pope had been satisfied to receive, Germany

would hardly have been unwilling to pay, the stipulated, before long the customary, tribute. The Bishop-Electors no longer took the lead, or dictated to the Prince-Electors. In general they were quietly magnificent, rather than turbulent or aggressive Prelates. Still the possession of three out of the seven suffrages for the Empire maintained at once the dignity of the Church, and made these prizes objects of ambition to the princely houses of Germany.¹ Nor did these archbishoprics stand alone. Metropolitans like those of Salzburg, Prague, Olmutz, Magdeburg; Bishops in the flourishing cities of the Rhine, Worms, Spiers, Strasburg, or in its neighborhood, Wurtzburg, Bamberg, Passau, Ratisbon, were, in their domains, privileges, feudal rights, and seignoralities, principalities. Yet all was apparent submission, harmony, mutual respect; perhaps the terrors of the Turkish invasion, equally formidable to Pope and Emperor, aided in keeping the peace. The balance of power was rather that of the Prince Electors and Princes of the Empire against the Emperor and the Pope, than of Emperor against Pope.² The estrangement from the Papal dominion, the once clamorous demand for the reformation of the Church, the yearning after Teutonic independence, had sunk into the depths of the national mind, into which it could not be followed by the most sagacious political or religious seer. The deep, silent, popular religious movement, from Master Eckhart, from the author of the

¹ In the fifteenth century, indeed, the Bishoprics began to be commonly bestowed on the younger sons of Sovereign Princes; the Court of Rome favored this practice, from the conviction that the Chapters could only be kept in order by the strong hand and the authority of Sovereign power &c. — Ranke's Germany, Mrs. Austen's Translation, i. p. 68.

² Compare the Introduction of Ranke.

Book on the Imitation of Christ, and from Tauler, above all, from the author of the German Theology and his disciples, might seem as if it was amassing strength upon the foundation of Latin Christianity and the hierarchical system; while these writers were the monitory signs, and as far as showing the uncongeniality of the Latin and Teutonic mind, the harbingers of the coming revolution.

England had long ceased to be the richest and most obedient tributary province of the Holy See. The Statutes of Mortmain, Provisors, Præmunire, had become the law of the land. Peers and Commons had united in the same jealousy of the exorbitant power and influence of the Pope. The remonstrances of the Popes against these laws had broken and scattered like foam upon the rocks of English pride and English justice.¹ The Clergy, as one of the estates of the realm, hold their separate Parliament, grant their subsidies or benevolences; but they now take a humbler tone, meekly deprecate rather than fulminate anathemas against those who invade their privileges and immunities. Trembling for their own power, they care not to vindicate with offensive haughtiness that of the Pope. The hierarchy, awed by the spreading opinions of the Lollards, had thrown themselves for protection under the usurping house of Lancaster, and had been accepted as faithful allies of the Crown under Henry IV. Though

¹ Under Henry IV., the Parliament resolves that the Pope's collector, though he had the Pope's Bull for this purpose, hath no jurisdiction within this realm. — 1 Henry IV. The Præmunire is confirmed against unlawful communication with Rome, at the same time that the Act against heresy is passed; and this act is not a Canon of the Church, but a Statute of the Realm. — Parliamentary History.

the Archbishop of York is at the head of the great Northern insurrection, on Henry's side are the successive Primates of Canterbury, Arundel, and Courtenay. It might seem that the Pope and the Crown, by advancing Englishmen of the noble houses to the Primacy, had deliberately determined on a league with the Lords against the civil and spiritual democracy — on one side of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw, on the other of the extreme followers of Wycliffe. The first act of this tacit league was to establish the throne of Henry Bolingbroke and put in execution the burning statute against heretics. It cannot be doubted that Archbishop Chicheley, in his support of the French war, sought less to propitiate the royal favor than to discharge on France some of the perilous turbulence which was fermenting in England. At the commencement of Henry VI. the Cardinal Beaufort of Winchester is striving for supreme power with the Duke of Gloucester; but Beaufort is a Prince of the blood, uncle of the King, as well as Bishop and Cardinal.¹ In the French wars, and the civil wars, the Bishops seem to have shrunk into their proper and more peaceful sphere. Chicheley was content with blowing the trumpet in the Parliament in London; he did not follow the King with the armed retainers of Canterbury. The high places of the Church — though so many of the younger as well as the elder sons of the nobility found more congenial occupation in the fields of France — were rarely left to men of humbler birth. Stafford, who succeeded Chicheley, was of the house of the

¹ Among the Ambassadors of England to Basle were the Bishops of London, Lisieux, Rochester, Bayeux, and Aix, and other English and Norman divines. — See Commission, Fuller's Church History, p. 178.

Counts of Stafford, Bouchier of the Earls of Essex.¹ Neville, brother of the Earl of Warwick, A.D. 1454. was Archbishop of York.² In the wars of the Roses, the Nobles, the Somersets, Buckinghams, Warwicks, Cliffords — not the Canterburies, Yorks, or Londons — are at the head of the conflicting parties. The banners of Bishops and Abbots wave not over the fields of Barnet, Towton, Wakefield, St. Alban's, Tewkesbury. It is not till the war is over that they resume their seat or authority in the Parliament or Council board. They acknowledge and do homage to the conqueror, York or Lancastrian, or, like Henry VII.,³ blending the two titles. From that time the Archbishop is the first subject in the realm, but in every respect a subject. Some of the great English Prelates, from Wykeham to Wolsey, seem to have been more prescient than those in other kingdoms of the coming change. It is shown in their consecration of large masses of ecclesiastical wealth and landed property for the foundation of col-

¹ Chicheley was said to be the son of a tailor. — Fuller, p. 182. His biographer rather confirms this, speaking respectfully of it as a reputable trade, p. 8.

² The Pope still maintained the form of the appointment to the Primacy. As in a case cited above of York, the monks of Canterbury elected Chicheley (no doubt under royal influence). The Pope refused the nomination, but himself appointed Chicheley by a Papal provision. Chicheley would not accept the Primacy till authorized by the King. Stafford's successor, Kemp, was in like manner elected by the Monks, refused, and then nominated of his own authority by the Pope. — Godwin, in Chicheley and Kemp. The Pope confirmed the election of Bouchier. — Godwin, in Bouchier. The Pope was thus content with a specious maintenance of his right, the more practical English with the possession of the real power.

³ "This king's reign afforded little Church storie," says Fuller. He fills it up with an account of an enormous banquet given by Neville, Archbishop of York. Neville could not help being a politician, when Edward, afterwards the IV.th, was a prisoner. He was in the custody of Neville, who does not seem to have watched him too carefully. Neville was seized and sent prisoner to Calais by Edward IV.

leges rather than monasteries, by Wykeham, Wainfleet, Fox, Wolsey. It can hardly be doubted that some wise Churchman suggested the noble design of Henry VI. in the endowment of King's at Cambridge and of Eton. Wolsey's more magnificent projects seem, as it were, to be arming the Church for some imminent contest; they reveal a sagacious foreknowledge that the Church must take new ground if she will maintain her rule over the mind of man.

Still on the whole throughout Christendom the vast fabric of the hierarchy stood unshaken. In England alone there was suppressed insurrection among the followers of Wycliffe, now obscure and depressed by persecution; and in Bohemia. There the irresistible armies of Ziska and Procopius had not only threatened to found an anti-hierarchical State, but for the mutual antipathy between the Slavonian and Teutonic races, they might have drawn Germany into the revolt. But Bohemia, again bowed under hierarchical supremacy, was brooding in sullen sorrow over her lost independence. In no other land, except in individual minds or small despised sects, was there any thought, any yearning for the abrogation of the sacerdotal authority. The belief was universal, it was a part of the common Christianity, that a mysterious power dwelt in the hierarchy, irrespective of the sanctity of their own lives, and not dependent on their greater knowledge, through study, of Divine revelation, which made their mediation absolutely necessary to escape eternal perdition and to attain eternal life. The keys were in their hands, not to unlock the hidden treasures of Divine wisdom in the Gospels, or solely to bind and loose by the administration of the great Sacraments;

but the keys absolutely of Heaven or Hell. Not, indeed, that death withdrew the soul from the power of the Priest; not even after it departed from the body was it left to the unerring judgment, to the inexhaustible mercy, of the one All-seeing Judge. In purgatory the Priest still held in his hands the doom of the dead man. This doom, in the depths of the other world, was hardly a secret. The torments of purgatory (and the precincts of purgatory were widened infinitely — very few were so holy as to escape, few so desperately lost as not to be admitted to purgatorial probation) might be mitigated by the expiatory masses, masses purchased by the wealthy at the price dictated by the Priest, and which rarely could be gained without some sacrifice by the broken-hearted relative or friend. They were more often lavishly provided for by the dying sinner in his will, when wealth clung to with such desperate tenacity in life is thrown away with as desperate recklessness. This religion, in which man ceased to be the guardian of his own soul — with all its unspeakable terrors, with all its unspeakable consolations (for what weak mind — and whose mind on such points was not weak? — would not hold as inestimable the certain distinct priestly absolution, or the prayers of the Church for the dead), — this vicarious religion was as much part of the ordinary faith, as much an article of Latin Christianity, as the retributive judgment of God, as the redemption through Christ.

It is difficult (however vain it may be) not to speculate how far the conservative reformation in the Pope and in the Hierarchy, urged so earnestly and eloquently by Gerson and D'Ailly, more vehemently .

and therefore more alarmingly, by the Council of Basle, might have averted or delayed the more revolutionary reform of the next century. Had not the Papacy, had not the Hierarchy, with almost judicial blindness, thrown itself across the awakening moral sense of man; had it not, by the invidious possession, the more invidious accumulation, of power and wealth, with all the inevitable abuses in the acquisition, in the employment, of that power and wealth, aggravated rather than mitigated their despotic yoke; had they not by such reckless defiance as the lavish preaching of Indulgences by profligate and insolent men, insulted the rising impatience, and shown too glaringly the wide disruption and distance between the moral and the ritual elements of religion; had not this flagrant incongruity of asserting the Divine power of Christ to be vested in men, to so great an extent utterly unchristian, compelled reflection, doubt, disbelief — at length indignant reprobation — would the crisis have come when it came? Who would have had the courage to assume the responsibility for his own soul? Who would have renounced the privilege of absolution? Who would have thrown himself on the vaguer, less material, less palpable, less, may it be said, audible mercy of God in Christ, and in Christ alone? Who would have withdrawn from what at least seemed to be, what was asserted and believed to be, the visible Church, in which the signs and tokens of Divine grace and favor were all definite, distinct, cognizable by the senses; were seen, heard, felt, and not alone by the inward consciousness? Who would have contented himself with being of that Invisible Church, of which the only sign was the answer of the

good conscience within, faith and hope unguaranteed by any earthly mediator, unassured by any authoritative form of words or outward ceremony? Who would have rested in trembling hope on the witness of the Spirit of God, concurrent with the testimony of the spirit within? We may imagine a more noiseless, peaceful, alas, we must add, bloodless change! We may imagine the Gospel, now newly revealed, as it were, in its original language (the older Testament in its native Hebrew), and illustrated by the earlier Greek Fathers, translated into all living languages, and by the new art of Printing become of general and familiar use, gradually dispersing all the clouds of wild allegoric interpretation, of mythology, and materialism, which had been gathering over it for centuries, and thus returning to its few majestic primal truths in the Apostolic Creed. We may even imagine the Hierarchy receding into their older sphere, instructors, examples in their families as in themselves, of all the virtues and charities; the religious administrators of simpler rites. Yet who that calmly, philosophically, it may almost be said religiously, surveys the power and strength of the Latin religion, the religion of centuries, the religion of a continent — its extraordinary and felicitous adaptation to all the wants and necessities of man — its sympathy with some of the dominant faculties of our being, those especially developed at certain periods of civilization — its unity — its magisterial authority — the depth to which it had sunk in the human heart — the feelings, affections, passions, fears, hopes, which it commanded: who that surveys it in its vast standing army of the Clergy, and Monks and Friars, that had so long taken service in

its defence, with its immense material strength of Churches, Monasteries, Established Laws, Rank; in its Letters, and in its Arts; in its charitable, educational, Institutions: who will not rather wonder at its dissolution, its abolition in so large a part of Christendom, than at its duration? It is not so marvellous that it resisted, and resisted with success; that it threw back in some kingdoms, for a time, the inevitable change; that it postponed in some until a more remote, more terrible and fatal rebellion some centuries after, the detrusion from its autocratic, despotic throne. Who shall be astonished that Latin Christianity so long maintained a large part of the world at least in nominal subjection; or finally, that it still maintains the contest with its rival Teutonic Christianity without, and the more dangerous, because unavowed, revolt within its own pale — the revolt of those who, in appearance its subjects, either altogether disdain its control, and, not able to accept its belief and discipline, compromise by a hollow acquiescence, or an unregarded, unpunished neglect of all discipline, for total inward rejection of belief?

CHAPTER II.

BELIEF OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

LATIN Christendom, or rather universal Christendom, was one (excepting those who were self-outlawed, or outlawed by the dominant authority from the Christian monarchy), not only in the organization of the all-ruling Hierarchy and the admission of Monkhood, it was one in the great system of Belief. With the exception of the single article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Nicene formulary had been undisturbed, and had ruled with undisputed sway for centuries. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as the Father was undoubtedly the doctrine of the early Latin writers; but this tenet stole noiselessly—it is not quite certain at what time—into the Creed. That Creed, framed at the great Council of Nicea, had been received with equal unanimity by the Greek and Latin Churches. Both Churches had subscribed to the anathemas pronounced by the second Council of Constantinople, and ratified by the first Council of Ephesus, against any Church which should presume to add one word or letter to that Creed. Public documents in Rome showed that Pope Leo III. had inscribed on a silver tablet the Creed of Rome without the words “from the Son,” as the authorized faith of the Latin

Church. In the great quarrel with Photius, the Greeks discovered, and charged against the Latins, this audacious violation of the decrees of the Councils, this unauthorized impious addition to the unalterable Creed of Nicea. The Patriarch of Constantinople charged it, justly or unjustly, against his own enemy, Nicolas I.¹ In the strife with Michael Cerularius, at the final disruption between the two Churches, this was one of the inextinguishable offences of the Latin Church. A.D. 1053. The admission of the obnoxious article by the Greeks at the Council of Florence was indignantly repudiated, on the return of the Legates from the Council, by the Greek Church. But the whole of Latin Christendom disdained to give ear to the protest of the Greeks; the article remained, with no remonstrance whatever from the West, in the general Latin Creed.

But the Creeds — that of the Apostles, that of
 Unity of
 popular
 religion. Nicea, or even that ascribed to St. Athanasius, and chanted in every church of the West — formed but a small part of the belief of Latin Christendom. That whole world was one in the popular religion. The same vast mythology commanded the general consent; the same angelology, demonology; the same worship of the Virgin and the Saints, the same reverence for pilgrimages and relics, the same notions of the life to come, of Hell, Purgatory, Heaven. In general, as springing out of like tendencies and prepossessions of mind, prevailed the like or kindred

¹ I know no more brief or better summary of the controversy than the common one in Pearson on the Creed. I have some doubts whether the accusation of Photius, as to its introduction, is personal against Pope Nicolas or against the Roman Church.

traditions ; the world was one in the same vulgar superstitions. Already, as has been seen, at the close of the sixth century, during the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, the Christianization not only of the speculative belief of man, of that which may justly be called the religion of man, was complete : but no less complete was the Christianization, if it may be so said, of the lingering Paganism. Man had divinized all those objects of awe and veneration, which rose up in new forms out of his old religion, and which were intermediate between the Soul and God, "God," that is, "in Christ," as revealed in the Gospels. Tradition claimed equal authority with the New Testament. There was supposed to be a perpetual power in the Church, and in the Hierarchy the Ruler and Teacher of the Church, of infinitely expanding and multiplying the objects of faith ; at length, of gradually authorizing and superinducing as integral parts of Christianity the whole imaginative belief of the Middle Ages. Even where such belief had not been canonically enacted by Pope or Council, the tacit acceptance by the general practice of Priest as well as of people was not less authoritative ; popular adoration invested its own objects in uncontested sanctity. Already the angelic Hierarchy, if not in its full organization, had taken its place between mankind and God ; already the Virgin Mary was rising, or had fully risen, into Deity ; already prayers rarely ascended directly to the throne of grace through the one Intercessor, a crowd of mediate agencies was almost necessary to speed the orison upward, and to commend its acceptance, as it might thwart its blessing. Places, things, had assumed an inalienable holiness, with a centred and emanative power of

imparting or withholding spiritual influences. Great prolific principles had been laid down, and had only to work in the congenial soil of the human mind. Now, by the infusion of the Barbaric or Teutonic element, as well as by the religious movement which had stirred to its depths the old Roman society, mankind might seem renewing its youth, its spring-time of life, with all its imaginative creativeness, and its unceasing surrender to whatever appeared to satisfy the yearnings of its hardly satisfied faith.

There was unity in the infinite diversity of the popular worship. Though each nation, province, parish, shrine, had its peculiar and tutelar Saint, none was without a Saint, and none denied the influence of the Saints of others. Christianity was one in this materialistic intercommunion between the world of man and the extramundane ; that ulterior sphere, in its purer corporeity, yet still, in its corporeity, was perpetually becoming cognizable to the senses of man. It was one in the impersonation of all the agencies of nature, in that universal Anthropomorphism, which, if it left something of vague and indefinite majesty to the Primal Parental Godhead, this was not from any high intellectual or mental conception of the incongruity of the human and divine ; not from dread of the disparagement of the Absolute and the Infinite ; from no predilection for the true sublimity of higher Spiritualism ; but simply because its worship, content to rest on a lower sphere, humanized all which it actually adored, without scruple, without limit ; and this not in language only, but in its highest conception of its real existence.

All below the Godhead was materialized to the

thought. Even within the great Triune Deity the Son still wore the actual flesh which he had assumed on earth ; the Holy Ghost became a Dove, not as a symbol, but as a constantly indwelt form. All beyond this supercelestial sphere, into which, however controversial zeal might trespass, awful reverence yet left in it some majestic indistinctness, and some confessed mysterious transcendentalism ; all lower, nearer to the world of man, angels and devils, the spirits of the condemned and the beatified Saints, were in form, in substance however subtilized, in active only enlarged powers, in affections, hatred or attachment, in passions, nothing more than other races of human beings.

There was the world of Angels and of Devils. The earlier faith, that of Gregory the Great, had Angels. contented itself with the notions of Angels as dimly revealed in the Scriptures. It may be doubted if any names of angels, except those in the Sacred Writings, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, or any acts not imagined according to the type and precedent of the angelic visitations in the Old and New Testament, will be found in the earlier Fathers. But by degrees the Hierarchy of Heaven was disclosed to the ready faith of mankind, at once the glorious type and with all the regular gradations and ranks of the Hierarchy upon Earth. There was a great celestial Church above, not of the beatified Saints, but of those higher than human Beings whom St. Paul had given some ground to distinguish by different titles, titles which seemed to imply different ranks and powers.

Latin Christendom did not give birth to the writer who, in this and in another department, influenced most powerfully the Latin mind. The author of those

extraordinary treatises which, from their obscure and doubtful parentage, now perhaps hardly maintain their fame for imaginative richness, for the occasional beauty of their language, and their deep piety — those treatises which, widely popular in the West, almost created the angel-worship of the popular creed, and were also the parents of Mystic Theology and of the higher Scholasticism — this Poet-Theologian was a Greek. The writings which bear the venerable name of Dionysius the Areopagite. Dionysius the Areopagite, the proselyte of St. Paul, first appear under a suspicious and suspected form, as authorities cited by the heterodox Severians in a conference at Constantinople.¹ The orthodox stood aghast: how was it that writings of the holy Convert of St. Paul had never been heard of before? that Cyril of Alexandria, that Athanasius himself, were ignorant of their existence? But these writings were in themselves of too great power, too captivating, too congenial to the monastic mind, not to find bold defenders.² Bearing this venerable name in their front, and leaving behind them, in the East, if at first a doubtful, a growing faith in their authenticity,³ they appeared in the West as a precious gift from the Byzantine Emperor to the Emperor Louis the Pious.

¹ Concilia sub ann. 533. Compare the Preface to the edition of Cor-derius.

² Photius, in the first article in his *Bibliotheca*, describes the work of a monk, Theodorus, who had answered four out of the unanswerable arguments against their authenticity, as the writings of the Areopagite; but about the answers of Theodorus, and his own impression of the authority and value of the books, Photius is silent. — Photii Biblioth. p. 1, ed. Bekker.

³ There is a quotation from them in a Homily of Gregory the Great, Lib. ii. Hom. 34, Oper. i. p. 1607. Gregory probably picked it up during his controversy in Constantinople. — (See vol. i. p. 435.) There is no other trace of an earlier version, or of their earlier influence in the West.

France in that age was not likely to throw cold and jealous doubts on writings which bore the hallowed name of that great Saint, whom she had already boasted to have left his primal bishopric of Athens to convert her forefathers, whom Paris already held to be her tutelar Patron, the rich and powerful Abbey of St. Denys to be her founder. There was living in the West, by happy coincidence, the one man who at that period, by his knowledge of Greek, by the congenial speculativeness of his mind, by the vigor and richness of his imagination, was qualified to translate into Latin the mysterious doctrines of the Areopagite, both as to the angelic world and the subtile theology. John Erigena hastened to make known in the West the "Celestial Hierarchy," the treatise "on the Name of God," and the brief chapters on the "Mystic Philosophy." These later works were more tardy in their acceptance, but perhaps more enduring in their influence. Traced downwards through Erigena himself, the St. Victors, Bonaventura, to Eckhart and Tauler in Germany, and throughout the unfailing succession of Mystics, they will encounter us hereafter.¹

The "Celestial Hierarchy" would command at once, and did command, universal respect for its authority, and universal reverence for its doctrines. The "Hierarchy" threw upward the Primal Deity, the whole Trinity, into the most awful, unapproachable, incomprehensible distance; but it filled the widening intermediate space with a regular succession

¹ The Preface of Corderius (Observat. xi.) briefly shows the connection of the pseudo-Dionysius with Scholasticism, especially with Thomas Aquinas. — Observat. xii. shows the innumerable references of Aquinas to those works; yet Aquinas was far less mystic than other schoolmen.

of superhuman Agents, an ascending and descending scale of Beings, each with his rank, title, office, function, superior or subordinate. The vague incidental notices in the Old and New Testament and in St. Paul (and to St. Paul doubtless Jewish tradition lent the names), were wrought out into regular Orders, who have each, as it were, a feudal relation, pay their feudal service (here it struck in with the Western as well as with the Hierarchical mind) to the Supreme, and have feudal superiority or subjection to each other. This theory ere long became almost the authorized Theology; it became, as far as such transcendent subjects could be familiarized to the mind, the vulgar belief. The Arts hereafter, when mature enough to venture on such vast and unmanageable subjects, accepted this as the tradition of the Church. Painting presumed to represent the individual forms, and even, in Milton's phrase, "the numbers without number" of this host of heaven.

The Primal Godhead, the Trinity in Unity, was alone Absolute, Ineffable, Inconceivable; alone Essential Purity, Light, Knowledge, Truth, Beauty, Goodness.¹ These qualities were communicated in larger measure in proportion to their closer approximation to itself, to the three descending Triads which formed the Celestial Hierarchy: — I. The Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones. II. The Dominations, Virtues, Powers III. Principalities, Archangels, Angels. This Celestial Hierarchy formed, as it were, concentric circles around

¹ The writer strives to get beyond Greek copiousness of expression, in order to shroud the Godhead in its utter unapproachableness. He is the Goodness beyond Goodness, *ὑπεράγαθος ἀγαθότης*, the Super-Essential Essence, *οὐσία ὑπερούσια*, Godhead of Godhead. *ὑπερθέος Θεότης*

the unapproachable Trinity. The nearest, and as nearest partaking most fully of the Divine Essence, was the place of honor. The Thrones, Seraphim, and Cherubim approximated most closely, with nothing intermediate, and were more immediately and eternally conformed to the Godhead. The two latter of these were endowed, in the language of the Scripture, with countless eyes and countless wings.¹ The second Triad, of less marked and definite attributes, was that of the Powers, Dominations, Virtues.² The third, as more closely approximating to the world of man, if it may be so said, more often visited the atmosphere of earth, and were the immediate ministers of the Divine purposes. Yet the, so-called, Areopagite laboriously interprets into a spiritual meaning all the forms and attributes assigned in the sacred writings to the Celestial Messengers, to Angels and Archangels. They are of fiery nature. Fire possesses most properties of the Divinity, permeating everything, yet itself pure and unmingled: all manifesting, yet undiscernible till it has found matter to enkindle; irresistible, invisible, subduing everything to itself; vivifying, enlightening, renewing, and moving and keeping everything in motion; and so through a long list of qualities, classed and distinguished with exquisite Greek perspicuity. He proceeds to their human form, allegorizing, as he goes on, the members of the human body, their wings, their partial nakedness, their bright or their priestly raiment,

¹ Πρωτὴν μὲν εἶναι φησι, τὴν περὶ Θεὸν οὖσαν ἀεὶ, καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμέσως ἡνωσθαι παραδεδομένην, τοὺς τε γὰρ ἀγνωτάτους θρόνους καὶ τὰ πολύμορφα καὶ πολύπτερα τάγματα Χερουβὶμ, Ἑβραίων φωνῇ, καὶ Σεραφὶμ ὀνομαζόμενα — C. vi.

² All this was said to be derived from St. Paul. Gregory the Great (Lib. ii. *Moralia*) has another distribution, probably from some other source.

their girdles, their wands, their spears, their axes, their measuring-cords, the winds, the clouds, the brass and tin, the choirs and hallelujahs, the hues of the different precious stones; the animal forms of the lion, the ox, the eagle, the horse; the colors of the symbolic horses; the streams, the chariots, the wheels, and finally, even the joy of the Angels.¹ All this, which to the wise and more reflective seemed to interpret and to bestow a lofty significance on these images, taken in its letter — and so far only it reached the vulgar ear — gave reality, gave a kind of authority and conventional certainty to the whole Angelic Host as represented and described for the popular worship. The existence of this regular Celestial Hierarchy became an admitted fact in the higher and more learned Theology; the Schoolmen reason upon it as on the Godhead itself: in its more distinct and material outline it became the vulgar belief. The separate and occasionally discernible Being and Nature of Seraphim and Cherubim, of Archangel and Angel, in that dim confusion of what was thought revealed in the Scripture, and what was sanctioned by the Church — of image and reality; this Oriental, half Magian, half Talmudic, but now Christianized theory, took its place, if with less positive authority, with hardly less questioned credibility, amid the rest of the faith.

But this, the proper, if it may be so said, most heavenly, was not the only Celestial Hierarchy. There was a Hierarchy below, reflecting that above; a mortal, a material Hierarchy: corporeal, as communicating divine light, purity, knowledge to corporeal Beings. The triple earthly Sacerdotal Order had its type in

¹ Ch. xv.

heaven, the Celestial Orders their antitype on earth. The triple and novene division ran throughout, and connected, assimilated, almost identified the mundane and supermundane Church. As there were three degrees of attainment, Light, Purity, Knowledge (or the divine vision), so there were three Orders of the Earthly Hierarchy, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; three Sacraments, Baptism, the Eucharist, the Holy Chrism; three classes, the Baptized, the Communicants, the Monks. How sublime, how exalting, how welcome to the Sacerdotalism of the West this lofty doctrine! The Celestial Hierarchy were as ^{Celestial} themselves; themselves were formed and or-^{Hierarchy.} ganized after the pattern of the great Orders in heaven. The whole worship of Man, in which they administered, was an echo of that above; it represented, as in a mirror, the angelic or superangelic worship in the Empyrean. All its splendor, its lights, its incense, were but the material symbols; adumbrations of the immaterial, condescending to human thought, embodying in things cognizable to the senses of man the adoration of the Beings close to the throne of God.¹

The unanswerable proof, were other wanting, of the Greek origin of the Celestial Hierarchy is, that in the Hierarchical system there is no place for the Pope, nor even — this perhaps might seem more extraordinary to the Gallic Clergy — for the Metropolitan. It recognizes only the triple rank of Bishops, Priests, and

¹ Ἐπεὶ μὴδὲ δυνατόν ἐστιν τῷ καθ' ἡμῶς νοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ὅλῃν ἐκείνην ἀναπεθεῖναι τῶν οὐρανίων Ἱεραρχιῶν μίμησιν τε καὶ θεωρίαν, εἰ μὴ τῇ κατ' αὐτοὺς ὁλοῇ χειραγωγίᾳ χρήσαιο τὰ μὲν φαινόμενα κύλλη τῆς ἀφανοῦς εὐπρεπείας ἐκεικονίσματα λογιζόμενος, καὶ τὰς εἰσθητὰς εὐωδίας ἐκτυπώματα τῆς νοητῆς διαδοσέως, καὶ τῆς αὐλοῦ φωτοδοσίας εἰκόνα τὰ ὑλικὰ φῶτα. — Lib. i. c. i. p. 8.

Deacons. Jesus to the earthly Hierarchy is as the higher Primal Godhead, as the Trinity, to the Celestial Hierarchy. He is the Thearchic Intelligence, the supersubstantial Being.¹ From him are communicated, through the Hierarchy, Purity, Light, Knowledge. He is the Primal Hierarch, that imparts his gifts to men; from him and through him men become partakers in the Divinity. The Sacraments are the channels through which these graces, Purification, Illumination, Perfection, are distributed to the chosen. Each Hierarchical Order has its special function, its special gifts. Baptism is by the Deacon, the Eucharist by the Priest, the Holy Chrism by the Bishop. What the Celestial Hierarchy are to the whole material universe the Hierarchy of the Clergy are to the souls of men; the transmittants, the sole transmittants, of those graces and blessings which emanate from Christ as their primal fountain.

Still, however, as of old,¹ angelic apparitions were *Demonology.* rare and infrequent in comparison with the demoniacal possessions, the demoniacal temptations and interferences. Fear was more quick, sensitive, ever-awake, than wonder, devotion, or love. Men might in their profound meditations imagine this orderly and disciplined Hierarchy far up in the remote heavens. The visitations to earth might be of higher or lower ministers, according to the dignity of the occasion or the holiness of the Saint. The Seraphim might flash light on the eye, or touch with fire the lip of the Seer; the Cherubim might make their celestial harmonies heard; the Archangel might sweep down on his terrible wings on God's mission of wrath; the Angel descend on his

¹ Θεαρχικώτατος νοῦς, ὑπερουσίος.

² Compare vol. ii. p. 95.

more noiseless mission of love. The air might teem with these watchful Beings, brooding with their protecting care over the Saints, the Virgins, the meek and lowly Christians.¹ They might be in perpetual contest for the souls of men with their eternal antagonists the Devils. But the Angelology was but dim and indistinct to the dreadful ever-present Demonology; their name, the Spirits of Air, might seem as if the atmosphere immediately around this world was their inalienable, almost exclusive domain.

So long as Paganism was the antagonist of Christianity, the Devil, or rather the Devils, took the names of Heathen Deities: to St. Martin of Tours, they were Jove, Mercury, Venus, or Minerva. They wore the form and the attributes of those rejected and degraded Gods, no doubt familiar to most by their statues, perhaps by heathen poetry — the statues not yet destroyed by neglect or by Christian Iconoclasm, the poetry, which yet sounded to the Christian ear profane, idolatrous, hateful.² At a later period the Heathen Deities have sunk into the obscure protectors of certain odious vices. Among the charges against Pope Boniface VIII. is the invocation of Venus and other Pagan demons, for success in gambling and other licentious

¹ Spenser's beautiful and well-known lines express the common feeling.

² "Nam interdum in Jovis personam, plerumque Mercurii, persæpe etiam ac Veneris ac Minervæ transfiguratum vultibus offerebat. — Sulp. Sever. Vit. S. Mat. cxxiii. Martin was endowed with a singular faculty of discerning the Devil. "Diabolum vero tam conspicabilem et subjectum oculis habebat, ut sive se in propriâ substantiâ contineret, sive in diversâ figuras spiritualesque nequitias transtulisset, qualibet ab eo sub imagin videretur." Once Martin promised the Devil the Divine forgiveness: the Day of Judgment, on his ceasing to persecute, and his repentance of his sins. "Ego tibi vero confisus in Domino, Christi misericordiam peto." The heterodox charity of St. Martin did not meet the same aversion as the heterodox theology of Origen.

occupations. So, too, in the conversion of the Germans, the Teutonic Gods became Demons. The usual form of recantation of heathenism was, "Dost thou renounce the Devils? Dost thou renounce Thonar, Woden, Saxnote?"¹ "Odin take you," is still the equivalent in some Northern tongues to "the Devil take you."²

But neither did the Greek Mythology, nor did that of the Germans, offer any conception like that of the later Jewish and the Christian Antagonist of God. Satan had no prototype in either. The German Teufel (Devil) is no more than the Greek Diabolus. The word is used by Ulphilas; and in that primitive translation Satan retains his proper name.³ But as in Greek and Roman heathenism the infernal Deities were perhaps earlier, certainly were more universally, than the deities of Olympus, darkened into the Demons, Fiends, Devils of the Christian belief; so from the Northern mythology, Lok and Hela, before and in a greater degree than Odin or the more beneficent and warlike Gods, were relegated into Devils. Pluto was already black enough, terribly hideous enough, cruel and unrelenting enough; he ruled in Tartarus, which was, of course, identified with Hell: so Lok, with his consummate wickedness, and consummate wiliness, as the enemy of all good, lent and received much of the power and attributes of Satan.

The reverent withdrawal not only of the Primal Parental Godhead, the Father, but likewise of the two coeternal Persons of the Trinity into their unapproachable solitude, partly perhaps the strong aversion to

¹ See vol. iii. p. 136.

³ Mark iii. 23. John xiii. 27. Edit. Zahn.

² Grimm. Mythologie, p. 568.

Manicheism, kept down, as it were, the antagonism between Good and Evil into a lower sphere. The Satan of Latin Christianity was no Eastern, almost coeval, coequal Power with Christ; he was the fallen Archangel, one it might be of the highest, in that thrice-triple Hierarchy of Angelic Beings. His mortal enemy is not God, but St. Michael. How completely this was the popular belief may appear from one illustration, the Chester Mystery of the Fall of Lucifer.¹ This drama, performed by the guilds in a provincial city in England, solves the insoluble problem of the origin of Evil through the intense pride of Lucifer. God himself is present on the scene; the nine Orders remonstrate against the overweening haughtiness of Lucifer, who, with his Devils, is cast down into the dark dungeon prepared for them.

But in general the sublimity even of this view of the Antagonist Power of Evil mingles not with the popular conception. It remained for later Poetry: it was, indeed, reserved for Milton to raise his image of Satan to appalling grandeur; and Milton, true to tradition, to reverential feeling, to the solemn serene grandeur of the Saviour in the Gospel, leaves the contest, the war with Satan, to the subordinate Angels and to Michael, the Prince of the Angels. The Son, as coequal in Godhead, sits aloof in his inviolate majesty.²

¹ Thus speaks Lucifer to the Celestial Hierarchy:

Destres, I commaunde you for to cease,
And see the bewtye that I beare,
All Heaven shines through my brightnes,
For God himself shines not so clear.

Chester Mysteries, p. 18.

² Remark Milton's wonderful sublimity, not merely in his central figure of him, who had not "lost all his original brightness," who was "not less than archangel ruined," but in his creation, it may almost be said, out of

The Devil, the Devils of the dark ages, are in the vulgar notion something far below the Lucifer, the fallen Son of the Morning. They are merely hideous, hateful, repulsive — often, to show the power of the Saint, contemptible. The strife for the mastery of the world is not through terrible outbursts of power. The mighty destructive agencies which war on mankind are the visitations of God, not the spontaneous, inevitable, or even permitted devastations of Satan. It is not through the loftier passions of man, it is mostly by petty tricks and small annoyances, that the Evil One endeavors to mislead or molest the Saint. Even when he offers temptations on a larger scale, there is in general something cowardly or despicable; his very tricks are often out-tricked. The form which he assumed, the attributes of the form, the horns, the tail, the cloven foot, are vulgar and ludicrous. The stench which betrays his presence: his howlings and screechings are but coarse and grovelling. At first, indeed, he was hardly permitted to assume the human form:¹

Selden's book, and the few allusions in the Old Testament, of a new Demonology. He throws aside the old Patristic Hierarchy of Devils, the gods of Greece and Rome, whom the revival of classical literature had now reinstated in their majesty and beauty, as seen in the Poets. He raises up in their stead the biblical adversaries of the Godhead of the Old Testament; the Deities of the nations, Canaan and Syria, circumjacent and hostile to the Jews. Before Milton, if Moloch, Belial, Mammon, were not absolutely unknown to poetry, they had no proper and distinct poetic existence. I owe the germ of this observation, perhaps more than the germ, to my friend Mr. Macaulay.

¹ Alors qu'aux yeux du vulgaire celui-ci fut devenu un être hideux, incohérent assemblage des formes les plus animales, et les plus effrayantes; un personnage grotesque à force d'être laid. — Maury, *Légendes, Pièces*, p. 198.

M. Maury says that the most ancient representation of the Devil in human form is in an ivory diptych of the time of Charles the Bald, p. 136, note. See also text.

his was a monstrous combination of all that was most ugly and hateful in the animal shape. If Devils at times assumed beautiful forms, as of wanton women to tempt the Saints, or entered into and possessed women of attractive loveliness, it was only for a time; they withdrew and shrunk back to their own proper and native hideousness.

Eyen Dante's Devils have but a low and menial malignity; they are base and cruel executioners, torturers, with a fierce but dastardly delight in the pains they inflict. The awful and the terrible is in the human victims: their passions, their pride, ambition, cruelty, avarice, treachery, revenge, alone have anything of the majesty of guilt: it is the diabolic in man, not the Devils acting upon men and through men, which makes the moral grandeur of his Inferno.

The symbol under which the Devil, Satan as Lucifer, as well as his subordinate fiends, are represented throughout this period, the Serpent, was sometimes terrific, often sunk to the low and the ludicrous. This universal emblem of the Antagonist Power of Evil runs through all religions,¹ (though here and there the Serpent is the type of the Beneficent Deity, or, coiled into a circular ring, of eternity.)² The whole was centred in the fearful image of the great Dragon in the Apocalypse. St. Michael slaying the Dragon is among the earliest emblems of the triumph

¹ The connection of the Dragon, Serpent, and Worm with the Devil in its countless forms is traced with inexhaustible learning by M. Maury, in his *Légendes Pieuses*, pp. 131, 154. So too the growth of each demoniac beast out of other notions, the lion, the wolf, the swine. It would be impossible to enter in such a work as this into the endless detail.

² The ample references of M. Maury on this subject might be enlarged. See too the work of Mr. Deane on the Worship of the Serpent.

of Good over Evil. From an emblem it became a religious historical fact. And hence, doubtless, to a great extent, the Dragon of Romance; St. George is but another St. Michael of human descent. The enmity of the serpent to the race of man, as expressed and seemingly countenanced by the Book of Genesis, adds wiliness to the simply terrible and destructive monster. Almost every legend teems with serpent demons. Serpents are the most dire torturers in hell. The worm that never dieth (Dante's great Worm) is not alone; snakes with diabolic instincts, or snakes actually devils, and rioting in the luxury of preying on the vital and sensitive parts of the undying damned, are everywhere the dreadful instruments of everlasting retribution.

Closely connected with these demoniac influences was the belief in magic, witchcraft, spells, talismans, conjurations. These were all the actual delusions or operations of obedient or assistant Evil Spirits. The Legislature of the Church and of the State, from Constantine down to a late period, the post-Papal period of Christianity; Roman, Barbarian, even modern Codes recognized as real facts all these wild hallucinations of our nature, and by arraying them in the dignity of heretical impious and capital offences, impressed more deeply and perpetuated the vulgar belief. They have now almost, but by no means altogether, vanished before the light of reason and of science. The most obstinate fanaticism only ventures to murmur, that in things so universally believed, condemned by Popes and Councils, and confirmed by the terrible testimony of the excommunication and the execution of thousands of miserable human beings, there must have been something more than our incredulous age will acknowl-

edge.¹ Wisdom and humanity may look with patience, with indulgence, with sympathy, on many points of Christian superstition, as bringing home to hearts which would otherwise have been untouched, unsoftened, unconsolated, the blessed influences and peace of religion ; but on this sad chapter, extending far beyond the dark ages, it will look with melancholy, indeed, but unmitigated reprobation. The whole tendency was to degrade and brutalize human nature : to degrade by encouraging the belief in such monstrous follies, to brutalize by the pomp of public executions, conducted with the solemnity of civil and religious state.

All this external world-environing world of Beings possessed the three great attributes, ubiquity, incessant activity with motion in inappreciable time, personality. God was not more omnipresent, more all-knowing, more cognizant of the inmost secrets of the human heart than were these angelic or demon hosts. These divine attributes might be delegated, derivative, permitted for special purposes ; but human fear and hope lost sight of this distinction, and invested every one of the countless præternatural agents in independent, self-existent, self-willed life. They had, too, the power of assuming any forms ; of endless and instantaneous transmutation.

But the Angels were not the only guardians and protectors of the faithful against the swarming, busy, indefatigable malignant spirits, which claimed the world of man as their own. It might seem as if human weakness required something less impalpable, more sensibly real, more akin to itself, than beings of light and air,

¹ See Görres, *Christliche Mystik*, that strange erudite rhapsody, which with all its fervor, fails to convince us that the author was in earnest.

which encircled the throne of God. Those Beings, in *The Saints*. their essence immaterial, or of a finer and more ethereal matter, might stoop to earth, or might be constantly hovering between earth and heaven; but besides them, as it were of more distinct cognizance by man, were those who, having worn the human form, retained it, or reassumed it, as it were clothing over their spiritualized being. The Saints, having been human, were more easily, more naturally conceived, as still endowed with human sympathies; intermediate between God and man, but with an imperishable inefaceable manhood more closely bound up with man. The doctrine of the Church, the Communion of Saints, implied the Church militant and the Church triumphant. The Christians yet on earth, the Christians already in heaven, formed but one polity; and if there was this kindred, if it may be so said, religious consanguinity, it might seem disparagement to their glory and to their union with Christ to banish them to a cold unconscious indifference, and abase them to ignorance of the concerns of their brethren still in the flesh. Each saint partook, therefore, of the instinctive omniscience of Christ. While unabsorbed in the general beatified community, he kept up his special interest and attachment to the places, the companions, the fraternities of his earthly sojourn; he exercised, according to his will, at least by intercession, a beneficent influence; he was tutelar within his sphere, and therefore within that sphere an object of devout adoration. And so, as ages went on, saints were multiplied and deified. I am almost unwilling to write it; yet assuredly, hardly less, if less than Divine power and Divine will was assigned by the popular sentiment to the Virgin and the

Saints. They intercepted the worship of the Almighty Father, the worship of the Divine Son. To them, rather than through them, prayer was addressed ; their shrines received the more costly oblations ; they were the rulers, the actual disposing Providence on earth : God might seem to have abandoned the Sovereignty of the world to these subordinate yet all-powerful agencies.

High above all this innumerable Host of Saints and Martyrs, if not within the Trinity (it were not easy, if we make not large allowance for the wild language of rapturous adoration, to draw any distinction), hardly below, was seated the Queen of Heaven.¹ The worship of the Virgin, since the epoch of Gregory the Great, had been constantly on the ascendant ; the whole progress of Christian thought and feeling converged towards this end.² The passionate adoration of the Virgin was among the causes of the discomfiture of Nestorianism — the discomfiture of Nestorianism deepened the passion. The title “Mother of God” had been the watchword of the feud ; it became the cry of victory. Perhaps as the Teutonic awe

¹ At qualis currus, cujus aurigæ sunt immortales Spiritus !
Qualis Illa quæ ascendit, et cui Deus fit obuius !
Hæc est Regina naturæ, et pæne gratiæ.
Tali pompâ excipienda est quæ Deum exceperat.
Adsurgite, anima, dic aliquid sublimius.
Ante adventum Mariæ regnabant in cælo tres personæ.
Nec (et ?) regnabant tres Reges.
Alterum thronum addidit homo Deus ;
Adventante Maria tertius thronus est additus.
Et nunc triplex in cælo regnum est, ubi erat unicum.
Sedet proxima Deo mater Dei.

Labbé in Elogiis. — Comp. Augusti, v. iii. p. 55.

² Compare on the earlier period Beugnot, *Destruction du Paganisme*, ii. 267. The whole subject of the progress of the worship of the Virgin, in Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iii. pp. 1, *et seq.*, with ample illustrations.

tended to throw back into more remote incomprehensibility the spiritual Godhead, and therefore the more distinct human image became more welcome to the soul ; so perhaps the purer and loftier Teutonic respect for the female sex was more prone to the adoration of the Virgin Mother. Iconoclasm, as the images of the Virgin Mother, then perhaps usually with the Child, were more frequent and regarded with stronger attachment, would seem a war specially directed against the blessed Mary ; her images, when they rose again, or, as was common, smiled again on the walls, would be the objects of still more devout wonder and love. She would vindicate her exalted dignity by more countless miracles, and miracles would be multiplied at once by the frantic zeal and by the more easy credulity of her triumphant worshippers ; she would glorify herself, and be glorified without measure. It was the same in the East and in the West. The East had early adopted in the popular creed the groundwork, at least, of the Gospel of the Infancy and of the other spurious Gospels, which added so prodigally to the brief allusions to the Mother in the genuine Gospels.¹ The Emperor Heraclius, it has been seen, had the Virgin on his banner of war ; to the tutelar protection of the Virgin Constantinople looked against the Saracen and the Turk. Chivalry above all would seem, as it were, to array the Christian world as the Church militant of the Virgin.² Every knight was the sworn servant of our Lady ; to her he looked for success in battle — strange as it may

¹ Perhaps the reception of these into the Korân as part of the universal Christian belief is the most striking proof of this.

² On the chivalrous worship of the Virgin, *Le Grand d'Ausey, Fabliaux*, v. 27.

sound, for success in softer enterprises.¹ Poetry took even more irreverent license ; its adoration in its intensity became revoltingly profane. Instead of hallowing human passion, it brought human passion into the sphere of adoration, from which it might have been expected to shrink with instinctive modesty. Yet it must be known in its utmost frenzy to be judged rightly.²

So completely was this worship the worship of Christendom, that every cathedral, almost every spacious church, had its Chapel of our Lady. In the hymns to the Virgin, in every breviary, more especially in her own "Hours" (the great universal book of devotion), not merely is the whole world and the celestial world put under contribution for poetic images, not only is all the luxuriance and copiousness of language exhausted, a new vocabulary is invented to express the yet inexpressible homage ; pages follow pages of glowing similitudes, rising one above another. In the Psalter of the Virgin almost all the incommunicable attributes of the Godhead are assigned to her ; she sits between Cherubim and Seraphim ; she commands, by her maternal influences, if not by authority, her

¹ The poetry of the Troubadours is full of this.

² C'est ainsi que le même Gautier (de Coron.) conçut pour la Vierge Marie un amour véritable, qui l'enflamma, le dévora toute sa vie. Elle était pour lui ce qu'est une amante pour le plus passionné des hommes. Il réunissait pour elle toutes les beautés qu'il apercevait dans les religieuses d'un couvent qu'il dirigeait ; lui adressait chaque jour des vers pleins d'amour, d'érotiques chansons ; il la voyait dans ses rêves, et quelquefois même quand il veillait, sous les formes les plus voluptueuses, et la croyait l'héroïne des mille aventures, que, dans son délire, il inventait, et puis racontait en vers innumérables. — Hist. Littéraire de la France, xix. p. 843.

To purify his imagination from this, let the reader turn to Petrarch's noble ode "*Vergine bella, che di sol vestita.*"

Eternal Son.¹ To the Festivals of the Annunciation and the Purification (or the Presentation of Christ in the Temple) was added that of the Assumption of the Virgin.² A rich and copious legend revealed the whole history of her birth and life, of which the Sacred Scriptures were altogether silent, but of which the spurious Gospels furnished many incidents,³ thus, as it were, taking their rank as authorities with the Apostolic four. And all this was ere long to be embodied in Poetry, and, it might seem, more imperishably in Art. The latest question raised about the Virgin — her absolute immunity from the sin of Adam — is the best illustration of the strength and vitality of the belief. Pious men could endure the discussion. Though St. Bernard, in distinct words which cannot be explained away, had repudiated the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin⁴ — though it was rejected by Thomas Aquinas,⁵ that Conception without any taint of hereditary sin, grew up under the authority of the rival of Aquinas. It became the subject of contention and controversy, from which the calmer Christian shrinks with intuitive repugnance. It divided the Dominicans and Franciscans into hostile

¹ *Excelsus super Cherubim Thronus ejus, et sedes ejus super cardines cœli. — Ps. cxlii. Domina Angelorum, regina Mundi! — Ps. xxxix. Quod Deus imperio, tu prece, Virgo, facis — Jure matris impera filio!*

² Titian's Assumption of the Virgin at Venice, to omit the Murillos, and those of countless inferior artists.

³ See these Gospels in Thilo Codex Apocryphus.

⁴ *Mariam in peccato conceptam, cum et ipsa vulgari modo per libidinem maris et fœminæ concepta est.* One is almost unwilling to quote in Latin what St. Bernard wrote. *Ad canon. Lugdun.* It is true St. Bernard made a vague submission on this, as on other points, to the judgment of the Church.

⁵ *Summa Theologiæ*, iii. 27, and in coarse terms.

camp, and was agitated with all the wrath and fury of a question in which was involved the whole moral and religious welfare of mankind.¹ None doubted² that it was within the lawful sphere of theology.³ Wonderful as it may seem, a doctrine rejected at the end of the twelfth century by the last Father of the Latin Church, has been asserted by a Pope of the nineteenth, and a Council is now sitting in grave debate in Rome on the Immaculate Conception.⁴

The worship of the Saints might seem to be endangered by their multiplicity, by their infinity. The crowded calendar knew not what day it could assign to the new Saint without clashing with, or dispossessing, an old one; it was forced to bear an endless accumulation on some favored days. The East and the West vied with each other in their fertility. The Greek Menologies are not only as copious in the puer-

¹ When the stranger travelling in Spain arrived at midnight at a convent-gate, and uttered his "Santissima Virgen," he knew by the answer, either "Sin pecado concebida," or by the silence with which the door opened, whether it was a Franciscan or a Dominican.

² Singular it may seem, the doctrine was first authorized by the reforming heterodox? Council of Basle, A. D. 1439. Session xxv. vi.

³ Even such a writer as Augustin Theiner was, can write such pages as appear in the *Vie de Clément XIV.*, i. p. 341.

⁴ Is there not wisdom enough in the Church, which has never been thought wanting in wisdom, to consider whether it is wise to inflame a passionate paroxysm of devotion in a very few; and to throw back, by an inevitable revulsion, and by so fatal an argument placed in their hands, multitudes into utter unbelief and contempt of all religion? — so had I written in 1854: the Council has passed its decree; by all who own its authority the Immaculate Conception is admitted, or, what is very different, not denied to be an Article of the Christian creed. But is not the utter and total apathy with which it has been received (one day's Spectacle at Rome, and nearly silent indifference throughout Christendom) the most remarkable sign of the times — the most unanswerable proof of the prostration of the strength of the Roman Church? There is not life enough for a schism on this vital point.

ility and trivialness of their wonders, they even surpass the Western Hagiologies. But of the countless Saints of the East, few comparatively were received in the West. The East as disdainfully rejected many of the most famous, whom the West worshipped with the most earnest devotion ; they were ignorant even of their names. It may be doubted if an Oriental ever uttered a prayer in the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Still that multiplicity of Saints, as it bore unanswerable witness to the vigor of the belief, so also to its vitality. It was constantly renewing its youth by the elevation of more favorite and recent objects of adoration. Every faculty, every feeling, every passion, every affection, every interest was for centuries in a state of perpetual excitement to quicken, keep alive, and make more intense this wonder-fed and wonder-seeking worship. The imagination, the generous admiration of transcendent goodness, of transcendent learning, or, what was esteemed even more Christian, transcendent austerity ; rivalry of Church with Church, of town with town, of kingdom with kingdom, of Order with Order ; sordid interest in the Priesthood who possessed, and the people who were permitted to worship, and shared in the fame, even in the profit, from the concourse of worshippers to the shrine of a celebrated Saint ; gratitude for blessings imputed to his prayers, the fruitful harvest, protection in war, escape in pestilence ; fear lest the offended Saint should turn away his face ; the strange notion that Saints were under an obligation to befriend their worshippers ; the still bolder Brahminical notion that Saints might be compelled, by the force of prayer, or even by the lavish oblation, to interpose their reluctant influence ; —

against all this stood one faculty of man alone, and that with difficulty roused out of its long lethargy, rebuked, cowed, proscribed, shuddering at what might be, which was sure to be, branded as impiety — the Reason. Already in the earliest period to doubt the wild wonders related of St. Martin of Tours is to doubt the miracles of the Gospel.¹ Popular admiration for some time enjoyed, unchecked, the privilege of canonization. A Saint was a Saint, as it were, by acclamation; and this acclamation might have *Canonization* been uttered in the rudest times, as during the Merovingian rule in France; or within a very limited sphere, as among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, so many of whose Saints were contemptuously rejected by the Norman Conqueror. Saints at length multiplying thus beyond measure, the Pope assumed the prerogative of advancing to the successive ranks of Beatitude and Sanctity. If this checked the deification of such perplexing multitudes, it gave still higher authority to those who had been recognized by more general consent, or who were thus more sparingly admitted to the honors of Beatification and Sanctification (those steps, as it were, of spiritual promotion were gradually introduced). The Saints ceased to be local divinities; they were proclaimed to Christendom, in the irrefragable Bull, as worthy of general worship.²

¹ *Quaquam minimè mirum sit si in operibus Martini infirmitas humana dabitaverit, cum multos hodieque videamus, nec Evangelicis quidem credidisse.* — Sulp. Sever., Dial. ii. 15. Sulpicius almost closes the life of St. Martin with these words: "De cætero si quis infideliter legerit, ipse peccabit."

² Canonization has been distributed into three periods. Down to the tenth century the Saint was exalted by the popular voice, the suffrage of the people with the Bishop. In the intermediate period the sanction of the Pope was required, but the Bishops retained their right of initiation. Al-

There were some, of course, the universal Saints of Christendom, the Apostles, the early martyrs; some of Latin Christendom, the four great Fathers of the Latin Church; some few, like St. Thomas of Canterbury, the martyr of the ecclesiastical Order, would be held up by the whole Hierarchy as the pattern and model of sanctity; St. Benedict, in all the Benedictine monasteries, the founders or reformers of the Monastic Institutes, St. Odo, St. Stephen Harding, St. Bernard, St. Romuald, St. Norbert. At a later period, and, above all, wherever there were Mendicant Friars (and where were there not?) St. Dominic and St. Francis would have their images raised, their legends read and promulgated with the utmost activity, and their shrines heaped with offerings. Each Order was bound especially to hold up the Saints of the Order; it was the duty of all who wore the garb to spread their fame with special assiduity.¹ The Dominicans and Franciscans could boast others besides their founders: the Dominicans the murdered Inquisitor Peter the Martyr,

alexander III. seized into the hands of the Pope alone this great and abused Prerogative. — Mabillon, Act. St. Benedict. V. in Præf.

¹ The great authority for the Lives of the Saints, of course with strong predilection for the Saints of the West, is the vast collection of the Bollandists, even in the present day proceeding towards its termination. On the origin and the writers of this Collection, consult Pitra, *Etudes sur la Collection des Actes des Saints par les Jésuites Bollandistes*. To me the whole beauty and value is in the original contemporary form (as some, for instance, are read in Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ*). In the Bollandists, or even in the Golden Legend of Jacob a Voragine, they become cold and controversial; the original documents are overlaid with dissertation. Later writers, like Alban Butler, are apologetic, cautious, always endeavoring to make the incredible credible. In the recent Lives of the English Saints, some of them admirably told, there is a sort of chilly psychological justification of belief utterly irreconcilable with belief; the writers urge that we ought to believe, what they themselves almost confess that they can only believe, or fancy they believe, out of duty, not of faith.

and St. Thomas Aquinas ; the Franciscans St. Antony of Padua, and San Bonaventura. Their portraits, their miracles, were painted in the churches, in the cloisters of the Friars ; hymns in their name, or sentences, were chanted in the services. All these were world-wide Saints : their shrines arose in all lands, their churches or chapels sprung up in all quarters. Others had a more limited fame, though within the pale of that fame their worship was performed with loyal fidelity, their legend read, their acts and miracles commemorated by architecture, sculpture, painting. As under the later Jewish belief each Empire had its guardian Angel, so each kingdom of Christendom had its tutelar Saint. France had three, who had each his sacred city, each, as it were, succeeded to, without dispossessing, the other. St. Martin of Tours was the older ; St. Remi, who baptized Clovis into the Catholic Church, had an especial claim on all of Frankish descent. But, as Paris rose above Tours and Rheims, so rose St. Denys, by degrees, to be the leading Saint of France. St. Louis was the Saint of the royal race.¹ St. Jago of Compostella, the Apostle of St. James, had often led the conquering Spaniard against the Musulman. The more peaceful Böniface, with others of the older missionaries, was honored by a better title in Germany. Some of the patron Saints, however, of the great Western kingdoms are of a later period, and sprung probably out of romance, perhaps were first inscribed on the banners to distinguish the several na-

¹ Charlemagne was a Saint (Baronius, sub ann. 814). He was unfortunately canonized by a Pseudo-Pope (Pascal). He was worshipped at Aix-la-Chapelle, Hildesheim, Osnaburg, Minden, Halberstadt — thus a German rather than a French Saint. See the Hymn to him, Daniel, i. p. 305, from the Halberstadt Breviary.

tions during the Crusades. For the dignity of most of these Saints there is sufficient legendary reason: as of St. Denys in France, St. James in Spain, St. Andrew in Scotland (there was a legend of the Apostle's conversion of Scotland), St. Patrick in Ireland. England, however, instead of one of the old Roman or Saxon Saints, St. Alban, or St. Augustine, placed herself under the tutelar guardianship of a Saint of very doubtful origin, St. George.¹ In Germany alone, notwithstanding some general reverence for St. Boniface, each kingdom or principality, even every city, town, or village, had its own Saint. The history of Latin Christianity may be traced in its more favored Saints, first Martyrs, then Bishops, then Fathers, Jerome, Augustin, Gregory, then Monks (the type St. Benedict). As the Church grew in wealth, Kings or Nobles, magnificent donors, were the Saints; as it grew in power, rose Hierarchical Saints, like Becket. St. Louis was the Saint of the Crusades and Chivalry; St. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura of Scholasticism. Female prophets might seem chosen to vie with those of the Fraticelli and of the Heretics; St. Catherine of Sienna, St. Bridget² (those Brides of Christ), who

¹ Dr. Milner (the Roman Catholic) wrote an Essay against Gibbon's assertion that "the infamous George of Cappadocia became the patron Saint of England." He was, I think, so far successful; but it is much more easy to say who St. George was not than who he was.

² St. Bridget was beatified by Boniface IX., canonized by John XXIII. at the Council of Constance, confirmed by St. Martin. The Swedes were earnest for their Saint (and she had had the merit of urging the return of the Popes from Avignon). But Gerson threw some rationalizing doubts on the visions of St. Bridget, and on the whole bevy of female Saints, which he more than obviously hinted might be the dupes or accomplices of artful Confessors. The strange wild rhapsodies, the visions of St. Bridget, under the authority of Turrecremata, were avouched by the Council of Basle. See Gerson's Tracts, especially *de probatione spirituum, de distinctione verarum visionum a falsis*. — Helyot, iv. p. 25, Shroock, xxxiii. p. 180, &c.

had constant personal intercourse with the Saints, with the Virgin, with our Lord himself. In later days Christian charity, as well as Mysticism, had its Saints, St. Vincent de Paul, with St. Teresa, and St. Francis de Sales.

To assert, to propagate the fame, the miracles, of his proper Saint was the duty of every King, of every burgher, of every parishioner, more especially of the Priesthood in the Church dedicated to his memory, which usually boasted of his body buried under the high altar, or of relics of that body. Most churches had a commemorative Anniversary of the Saint, on which his wonders were the subjects of inexhaustible sermons. It was the great day of pomp, procession, rejoicing, feasting, sometimes rendered more attractive by some new miracle, by some marvellous cure, some devil ejected, something which vied with or outdid the wonders of every neighboring Saint. Of old, the Saint-worshippers were more ambitious. In the days of St. Martin, Sulpicius Severus urges on his friend Posthumianus to publish everywhere, in his distant travel or on his return from the East, the fame of St. Martin.¹ "Pass not Campania; make him known to the holy Paulinus, through him it will be published in Rome, in Italy, and in Illyricum. If you travel to the right, let it be heard in Carthage, where he may rival Cyprian; if to the left, in Corinth, who will esteem him wiser than Plato, more patient than Socrates. Let Egypt, let Asia hear the fame of the Gaulish Saint." That, however, was when Saints were

¹ *Dum recurris diversasque regiones, loca, portus, insulas, urbesque præter legis, Martini nomen et gloriam sparge per populos. — V. S. Martini, Dialog. iii. p. 583.*

rare. More restricted commerce, and the preoccupation of every land, every city, every church with its own patron Saint, confined within the province, city, or hamlet, all who had not some universal claim to respect, or some wide-spread fraternity to promulgate their name. Yet though there might be jealousy or rivalry in the worship of distant or neighboring Saints; as the heathens denied not the gods of other nations, even hostile nations, whom themselves did not worship as gods; so none would question the saintship, the intercessory powers, the marvels of another Saint.

Thus throughout Christendom was there to every community and every individual man an Intercessor with the one Great Intercessor between God and man, some intermediate being, less awful, more humble, whose office, whose charge, almost whose duty it was to speed, or who, if offended, might withhold the suppliant orison. Every one of these Saints had his life of wonder, the legend of his virtues, his miracles, perhaps his martyrdom, his shrines, his relics. The legend was to his votaries a sort of secondary Gospel, wrought into the belief by the constant iteration of its names and events. The legend, in truth, was the dominant, universal poetry of the times. Unless it had been poetry it had not ruled the mind of man; but, having been poetry, it must submit to remain poetry. It is the mythic literature of Christendom,¹ interminable in its extent; but, as its whole life

¹ M. Maury's work, "Les Légendes Pieuses," has exhausted the subject. The more cautious readers must be warned that M. Maury carries up his system, where few Christians will follow him, with hardly less audacity than Strauss himself, into the Scriptural narratives. But while we admit that the desire of conformity with the Life of the Saviour suggested a great part of the incidents, and that the Gospel miracles suggested the miracles

is in its particularity, it suffers and withers into dulness by being brought into a more compendious form ; and so it is that Hagiography has withdrawn into its proper domain, and left the province of human affairs to history, which is not disdainful, of course, of the incidental information or illustration of events, manners, characters, which transpire through the cloud of marvels. Even the philosophy of history endeavors only to divine how men believed, or believed that they believed, this perpetual suspension or abrogation of the laws of nature ; how that which was then averred on the authority of experience has now fallen into neglect as contrary to all experience : so that even the most vigorous attempt to reinstate them is received as a desperate, hardly serious, effort of paradoxical ingenuity, falls dead on the general mind, hardly provokes scorn or ridicule, and, in fact, is transcended in interest by every transitory folly or new hallucination which seems to be the indispensable aliment required by some part of mankind in the highest as in the lowest social or intellectual state.

The legend was perpetually confirmed, illustrated, kept alive by the substantial, if somewhat Relics. dimly and mysteriously shown, relics which were either in the church, under the altar, or upon the altar ; the treasure of the community, or the property, the talis-

of the later Saints — the originality, the truth, the unapproachable dignity of the Gospel type is not only unimpaired, but to me becomes only more distinct and real. There is an intimate harmony, nowhere else found, between the moral and the supernatural. The line appears in my judgment broad and clear ; and those who, like the modern advocates for the belief of the Middle Ages, resolve the whole into the attainment of a proper frame of mind to receive legend as truth, seem to me to cut up altogether all belief in miracle.

Compare some good observations of M. Ampère, Leçon XIV.

man of the prelate, the noble, or the king. The reliquary was the most precious ornament in the lady's chamber, in the knight's armory, in the king's hall of state, as well as in that of the Bishop or the Pope. Our history has perhaps dwelt on relics with sufficient frequency. Augustine, in the earlier times, had reproved the wandering monks who made a trade of selling martyrs' limbs, "if indeed they are the limbs of martyrs."¹ The Theodosian Code had prohibited the violation of the tombs of the martyrs, and the removal and sale of their bodies.² Gregory the Great had reproved the Greek practice of irreverently disinterring and sending about the bodies of Saints: he refused to the Empress of Constantinople relics of St. Paul.³ We have seen with what jealous parsimony he distributed the filings of the chains of St. Peter.⁴ But, as the world darkened, these laws fell into desuetude: the first reverential feeling died away. In truth, to the multiplication, dissemination, veneration of relics conspired all the weaknesses, passions, innate and seemingly inextinguishable propensities of mankind; the fondness for cherishing memorials of the beloved, in human affection so excusable, so amiable, how much more so of objects of holy love, the Saints, the Blessed Virgin, the Saviour himself! the pride of possessing what is rare; the desire to keep alive religious associations and religious thoughts; the ignorance of the priesthood, the pious fraud of the priesthood, admitted to be Christian

¹ De oper. Monachorum, c. 8.

² Humanum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat, nemo martyrem detrahat, nemo mercetur.

³ Ad Imperat. Constant. — Compare Act. Ordinis S. Benedicti II. Fxix. xxx.

⁴ Vol. ii. p. 98.

virtue in order to promote devotion and so the spiritual welfare of man. Add to all this the inherent indefeasible power ascribed to relics to work miracles. No wonder that with the whole Christian world deeming it meritorious and holy to believe, dangerous, impious to doubt, there should be no end or limit to belief; that the wood of the true Cross should grow into a forest; that wild fictions, the romance of the Wise Men of the East transmuted into kings, the Eleven Thousand Virgins, should be worshipped in the rich commercial cities on the Rhine; that delicacy and even reverence should not take offence, as at the milk of the Blessed Virgin; that the most perishable things should become imperishable, the garments of the Saviour and the Saints. Not even the fiercest feuds could detect imposture. Tours and Poitiers quarrelled for the body of St. Martin; St. Benedict was stolen away from Italy: we have seen the rejoicing at his arrival in France; and the expedition sent by Eginhard to Italy in search of pious plunder. There were constant wars between monastery and monastery; marauding campaigns were carried on against some neighboring treasure-house. France was smitten with famine, because Clotaire II. cut off and stole an arm of St. Denys, under the instigation of the Devil.¹ It was virtue in St. Ouen to steal the head of St. Marculph. But as to disputing the genuineness, unless of rival relics, or questioning their wonder-working power, it never entered into the profane thought of man. How the Crusades immeasurably increased

¹ *Annales Dagobert.* Herman Corner gives the price of some relics. Egilmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, bought for his Church (A. D. mxxi.) an arm of St. Augustine, at Pavia, for 100 talents of pure silver and one of gold.

the wealth of Western Christendom in relics, how they opened an important branch of traffic, needs no further illustration. To the very verge of our historic period the worship of relics is in its unshaken authority. At the close of the fourteenth century the Duke of Berry obtains a piece of the head of St. Hilary of Poitiers as a most splendid present for the city of Poitiers from the Abbey of St. Denys;¹ he had already obtained the chin. The exhibition of the Holy Coat of Trèves — a treasure possessed by more than one other Church, and more than one avouched by Papal authority — may show how deep-rooted in human nature is this strange form of religiousness. One of the most remarkable illustrations of relic-worship occurs after the close of our history, during the pontificate of Æneas Sylvius, Pius II. The head of St. Andrew (Amalfi boasted the immemorial possession of the body) had been worshipped for centuries at Patras. As the Turks advanced in the Morea, the fugitive Despot would not leave this precious treasure exposed to the profane insults of the unbelievers. He carried it with him in his flight. Kings vied for the purchase; vast sums were offered. The Pope urged upon the Despot that he could not permit such a relic to repose anywhere but at Rome. The head of St. Andrew should rest by that of his brother St. Peter; the Saint himself would resist any other arrangement. The Despot arrived at Ancona with his freight. It was respected by the stormy seas. A Cardinal of the most blameless life

¹ *Particulam quandam capitis ejus sancti, a parte posteriori versus aurem dextram ad modum trianguli, in longitudine et latitudine spacium trium digitorum.* — *Rel. de St. Denys.* xiv. 16. The mutilation seems not to have been thought irreverent.

was chosen to receive and inspect the relic ; by what signs he judged the head to be that of St. Andrew we know not. But Romagna was in too dangerous a state to allow it at once to be transported to Rome ; the fierce Piccinino or the atheist Malatesta would not have scrupled to have seized it for their own use, worshipped it, or sold it at an exorbitant price. It was conveyed for security to the strong fortress of Narni. When Piccinino's forces were dispersed, and peace restored, it was brought in stately procession to Rome. It was intended that the most glorious heads of St. Peter and St. Paul should go forth to meet that of their brother Apostle. But the vast mass of gold which enshrined, the cumbrous iron which protected, these relics were too heavy to be moved : so without them the Pope, the Cardinals, the whole population of Rome thronged forth to the meadows near the Milvian Bridge. The Pope made an eloquent address to the head ; a hymn was sung, entreating the Saint's aid in the discomfiture of the Turks. It rested that day on the altar of St. Maria del Popolo, was then conveyed through the city, decorated with all splendor (the Jubilee under Nicolas V. saw not Rome more crowded), to St. Peter's. Cardinal Bessarion preached a sermon ; the head was deposited with those of his brother Apostles under the high altar.¹

Throughout the Middle Ages the world after death continued to reveal more and more fully its awful secrets. Hell, Purgatory, Heaven became more distinct, if it may be so said, more visible. Their site, their topography, their torments, their trials, their enjoyments, became more conceivable, almost more palpable to

¹ Commentarii Pii II.

sense: till Dante summed up the whole of this traditional lore, or at least, with a Poet's intuitive sagacity, seized on all which was most imposing, effective, real, and condensed it in his three coördinate poems. That Hell.

Hell had a local existence, that immaterial spirits suffered bodily and material torments; none, or scarcely one hardy speculative mind, presumed to doubt.¹ Hell had admitted, according to legend, more than one visitant from this upper world, who returned to relate his fearful journey to wondering man: St. Fiercy,² St. Vettin,³ a layman Bernilo.⁴ But all these early descents interest us only as they may be supposed or appear to have been faint types of the great Italian Poet. Dante is the one authorized topographer of the mediæval Hell.⁵ His originality is no more called in question by these mere signs and manifestations of the popular belief than by the existence and reality of

¹ Scotus Erigena, perhaps alone, dared to question the locality of Hell, and the material tortures of the damned. *Diversas suppliciorum formas non localiter in quadam parte, veluti toto hujus visibilis creaturæ, et ut simpliciter dicam neque intra diversitatem totius naturæ a Deo conditæ futuras esse credimus; et neque nunc esse, et nusquam et nunquam.* The punishment in which Erigena believed was terrible remorse of conscience, the sense of impossible repentance or pardon. At the final absorption of all things, that genuine Indian absorption, derived from his master the Pseudo-Dionysius, evil and sin would be destroyed forever, not evil ones and sinners. Erigena boldly cites Origen, and extorts from other authorities an opinion to the same effect, of the final salvation, the return unto the Deity, of the Devil himself. There is nothing eternal but God. *Omne quod æternum in Deo solummodo intelligi; nec ulla æternitas extra eum qui solus est æternus et æternitas.* He thus gets rid of all relating to eternal fire. Read the remarkable passage in the 5th Book de Natura, from the xxv.th at least to xxxvi.th chapters.

² Bede, iii. 19. Mabillon, *Acta S. Benedicti*, iii. 307. The Bollandists, Jan. ii. p. 44.

³ Mabillon, iv. 272.

⁴ Flodoard, iii. 3.

⁵ See Damiani's Hell and Heaven, iv. Ep. xiv. viii. 2. Consult also Cædmon.

those objects or scenes in external nature which he describes with such unrivalled truth.¹ In Dante meet unreconciled (who thought of or cared for their reconciliation?) those strange contradictions, immaterial souls subject to material torments: spirits which had put off the mortal body, cognizable by the corporeal sense.² The mediæval Hell had gathered from all ages, all lands, all races, its imagery, its denizens, its site, its access, its commingling horrors; from the old Jewish traditions, perhaps from the regions beyond the sphere of the Old Testament; from the Pagan poets, with their black rivers, their Cerberus, their boatman and his crazy vessel; perhaps from the Teutonic Hela, through some of the earlier visions. Then came the great Poet, and reduced all this wild chaos to a kind of order, moulded it up with the cosmical notions of the times, and made it, as it were, one with the prevalent mundane system. Above all, he brought it to the very borders of our world; he made the life beyond the grave one with our present life; he mingled in close

¹ There is a strange book written at the beginning of the seventeenth century, "De Inferno," by Antonio Rusca (Milan, 1621). It is dedicated with fearful simplicity to our Saviour. It settles gravely, logically, as it would be supposed authoritatively, and not without erudition, every question relating to Hell and its Inhabitants, its place, extent, divisions, torments.

² This was embarrassing to the philosophic heathen. "Tantum valuit error, ut corpora cremata cum scirent, tamen ea fieri apud inferos fingerent, quæ sine corporibus nec fieri possunt nec intelligi. Animos enim per seipsoz viventes non poterant mente complecti, formam aliquam figuramque quærebant." — Cicer. Tusc. i. c. 16. Rusca lays it down as the Catholic doctrine, "Docet tamen Catholica veritas, infernum malorum carcerem esse locum quendam materiale et corporeum." l. c. xxviii. The more enlightened Peter Lombard speaks of "non corporalem, sed corpori similem." Souls were borne bodily to Heaven by visible Angels, fought for by visible Devils. See the battle for the Soul of King Dagobert. Maury, p. 49.

and intimate relation the present and the future. Hell, Purgatory, Heaven were but an immediate expansion and extension of the present world. And this is among the wonderful causes of Dante's power, the realizing the unreal by the admixture of the real : even as in his imagery the actual, homely, everyday language or similitude mingles with and heightens the fantastic, the vague, the transmundane. What effect had hell produced, if peopled by ancient, almost immemorial objects of human detestation, Nimrod or Iscariot, or Julian or Mohammed ? It was when Popes all but living, Kings but now on their thrones, Guelfs who had hardly ceased to walk the streets of Florence, Ghibellines almost yet in exile, revealed their awful doom — this it was which, as it expressed the passions and the fears of mankind of an instant, immediate, actual, bodily, comprehensible place of torment : so, wherever it was read, it deepened that notion, and made it more distinct and natural. This was the Hell, conterminous to the earth, but separate, as it were, by a gulf passed by almost instantaneous transition, of which the Priesthood held the keys. These keys the audacious Poet had wrenched from their hands, and dared to turn on many of themselves, speaking even against Popes the sentence of condemnation. Of that which Hell, Purgatory, Heaven were in popular opinion during the Middle Ages, Dante was but the full, deep, concentrated expression ; what he embodied in verse all men believed, feared, hoped.

Purgatory had now its intermediate place between Purgatory. Heaven and Hell, as unquestioned, as undisturbed by doubt ; its existence was as much an article of uncontested popular belief as Heaven or Hell. It

were as unjust and unphilosophical to attribute all the legendary lore which realized Purgatory, to the sordid invention of the Churchman or the Monk, as it would be unhistorical to deny the use which was made of this superstition to exact tribute from the fears or the fondness of mankind. But the abuse grew out of the belief; the belief was not slowly, subtly, deliberately instilled into the mind for the sake of the abuse. Purgatory, possible with St. Augustine,¹ probable with Gregory the Great, grew up, I am persuaded (its growth is singularly indistinct and untraceable), out of the mercy and modesty of the Priesthood. To the eternity of Hell torments there is and ever must be — notwithstanding the peremptory decrees of dogmatic theology and the reverential dread in so many religious minds of tampering with what seems the language of the New Testament — a tacit repugnance. But when the doom of every man rested on the lips of the Priest, on his absolution or refusal of absolution, that Priest might well tremble with some natural awe — awe not confessed to himself — at dismissing the soul to an irrevocable, unrepealable, unchangeable destiny. He would not be averse to pronounce a more mitigated, a reversible sentence. The keys of Heaven and of Hell were a fearful trust, a terrible responsibility; the key of Purgatory might be used with far less presumption, with less trembling confidence. Then came naturally, as it might seem, the strengthening and exaltation of the efficacy of prayer, of the efficacy of the religious ceremonials, of the efficacy of the sacrifice of the altar, and the efficacy of the intercession of the Saints: and these all within the province, within the power of the

¹ *De fide et oper.*, c. 16. On Gregory, see note, vol. ii. p. 101.

Sacerdotal Order. Their authority, their influence, their intervention, closed not with the grave. The departed soul was still to a certain degree dependent upon the Priest. They had yet a mission, it might be of mercy; they had still some power of saving the soul after it had departed from the body. Their faithful love, their inexhaustible interest might yet rescue the sinner; for he had not reached those gates — over which alone was written, “There is no Hope” — the gates of Hell. That which was a mercy, a consolation, became a trade, an inexhaustible source of wealth. Praying souls out of Purgatory by Masses said on their behalf, became an ordinary office, an office which deserved, which could demand, which did demand, the most prodigal remuneration. It was later that the Indulgence, originally the remission of so much penance, of so many days, weeks, months, years; or of that which was the commutation for penance, so much almsgiving or munificence to churches or Churchmen, in sound at least extended (and mankind, the high and low vulgar of mankind, are governed by sound) its significance: it was literally understood, as the remission of so many years, sometimes centuries, of Purgatory.¹

If there were living men to whom it had been vouchsafed to visit and to return and to reveal the secrets of

¹ Unde quibusdam in locis concedebantur tandem expresse indulgentiæ a pœnâ et a culpâ, licet quidam summi Pontifices absurdum censuisse videntur aliquas indulgentias a pœnâ et a culpâ esse nominandas, cum a solo Deo culpa deleatur; et indulgentia est remissio pœnæ temporalis, . . . Unde quidam concessionem hujusmodi magis deceptionem quam indulgentiarum concessionem interpretantes cum eas intentu lucris temporalis fieri judicabant, dicere non timebant, anima nostra nauseat super cibo levissimo. — Gobelinus Persona, p. 320. This was in Germany during the Schism, above a century before Luther.

remote and terrible Hell, there were those too who were admitted in vision, or in actual life to more accessible Purgatory, and brought back intelligence of its real local existence, and of the state of souls within its penitential circles. There is a legend of St. Paul himself; of the French monk St. Farcy; of Drithelm, related by Bede; of the Emperor Charles the Fat, by William of Malmesbury. Matthew Paris relates two or three journeys of the Monk of Evesham, of Thurkill, an Essex peasant, very wild and fantastic. The Purgatory of St. Patrick, the Purgatory of Owen Miles, the vision of Alberic of Monte Casino, were among the most popular and wide-spread legends of the ages preceding Dante; and as in Hell, so in Purgatory, Dante sums up in his noble verses the whole theory, the whole popular belief as to this intermediate sphere.¹

If Hell and Purgatory thus dimly divulged their gloomy mysteries, if they had been visited by those who returned to actual life, Heaven was Heaven.

unapproached, unapproachable. To be wrapt to the

¹ Vincent of Beauvais. See the curious volume of Mr. Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, on Tundale, p. 32, &c. On Patrick's Purgatory in all its forms, as sanctioned by Popes, and by the Bollandist writers, as it appears in Calderon's poetry, and as it is kept up by Irish popular superstition and priestcraft, Mr. Wright has collected many wild details. Papal authority, as shown by an Inscription in the cloister of St. Andrea and St. Gregorio in Rome, testifies to the fact, which, I suspect, would have startled St. Gregory himself, that he got a monk out of Purgatory at the expense of thirty masses.

D. G. M.

Clemens Papa X.

Cultum Clementium VIII. et VIII

Imitatus . .

In hoc S. Gregorii Templum.

Ubi xxx missis animam monachi

Ex igne purgatorio liberavit, &c.

Copied by an accomplished friend of the author.

higher Heaven remained the privilege of the Apostle; the popular conception was content to rest in modest ignorance. Though the Saints might descend on beneficent missions to the world of man; of the site of their beatitude, of the state of the Blest, of the joys of the supernal world, they brought but vague and indefinite tidings. In truth, the notion of Heaven was inextricably mingled up with the astronomical and cosmogonical as well as with the theological notions of the age. Dante's Paradise blends the Ptolemaic system with the nine angelic circles of the Pseudo Dionysius; the material heavens in their nine circles; above and beyond them, in the invisible heavens, the nine Hierarchies; and yet higher than the highest heavens the dwelling of the Ineffable Trinity. The Beatific Vision, whether immediate or to await the Last Day, had been eluded rather than determined, till the rash and presumptuous theology of Pope John XXII. compelled a declaration from the Church. But yet this ascent to the Heaven of Heavens would seem from Dante, the best interpreter of the dominant conceptions, to have been an especial privilege, if it may be so said, of the most Blessed of the Blessed, the Saint of Saints. There is a manifest gradation in Beatitude and Sanctity. According to the universal cosmical theory, the Earth, the round and level earth, was the centre of the whole system.¹ It was usually supposed to be encircled by the

¹ The Eastern notions may be gathered from the curious *Treatise of Cosmas Indicopleustes*, printed by Montfaucon, in his *Collectio Nova*. Cosmas wrote about A. D. 535. He is perhaps the earliest type of those who call themselves Scriptural Philosophers; with all the positiveness and contemptuousness of ignorance, he proves that the heavens are a vault, from Isaiah xi. 22; from Job, according to the LXX., and St. Paul's image of a Tabernacle. The second Prologue is to refute the notion that the earth is a sphere, — the antipodes, which at first were not so disdainfully denied, are

vast, circumambient, endless ocean ; but beyond that ocean (with a dim reminiscence, it should seem, of the Elysian Fields of the poets) was placed a Paradise, where the souls of men hereafter to be blest, awaited the final resurrection. Dante takes the other theory : he peoples the nine material heavens — that is, the cycle of the Moon, Venus, Mercury, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, the fixed stars, and the firmament above, or the *Primum Mobile* — with those who are admitted to a progressively advancing state of glory and blessedness. All this, it should seem, is below the ascending circles of the Celestial Hierarchies, that immediate vestibule or fore-court of the Holy of Holies, the Heaven of Heavens, into which the most perfect of the Saints are admitted. They are commingled with, yet unabsorbed by, the Redeemer, in mystic union ; yet the mysticism still reverently endeavors to maintain

now termed *γροῦδες μύθοι*: men would fall in opposite directions. Paradise is beyond the circumfluent Ocean ; souls are received in Paradise till the last day (p. 315). He afterwards asserts the absolute incompatibility of the spherical notion of the earth with the resurrection. He gives several opinions, all of which, in his opinion, are equally wrong. *Οἱ μὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς μόνας μετὰ θάνατον, περιπολεύειν σὺν τῇ σφαίρᾳ, καὶ ὁρᾶν ἥτοι γινώσκειν πάντα λέγουσι· οἱ δὲ καὶ μετενσωμάτωσιν βούλονται, καὶ προβιοτὴν ἀσπύζουσι, οἷς καὶ ἔπεται λέγειν ἐξ ἀπολουθίας καταλύεσθαι τὴν σφαῖραν.* The heavens are indissoluble, and all spiritualized bodies are to ascend to heaven. He gets rid of the strong passages about the heavens passing away, as metaphors (this in others he treated as absurd or impious). He denies the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles.

It is remarkable that what I presume to call the Angelology of this Treatise shows it to be earlier than the Pseudo-Dionysius ; that work cannot have been known to Cosmas. One office of the Angels is to move — they are the perpetual movers of, the Sun, Moon, and Stars. After the Last day, the stars, sun, and moon being no more wanted, the Angels will be released from their duty, p. 154. The Angels carry the rain up from heaven into the clouds, and so manage the stars as to cause Eclipses. These are guardian Angels. The Angels do not ascend above the stars, a. 315.

the distinction in regard to this Light, which, as it descended upon earth, is drawn up again to the highest Heavens, and has a kind of communion with yet Incommunicable Deity. That in all the Paradise of Dante there should be a dazzling sameness, a static indistinctness, an inseparable blending of the real and the unreal, is not wonderful, if we consider the nature of the subject, and the still more incoherent and incongruous popular conceptions which he had to represent and to harmonize. It is more wonderful that, with these few elements, Light, Music, and Mysticism, he should, by his singular talent of embodying the highly abstract and metaphysical thought in the living imagery, represent such things with the most objective truth, yet without disturbing their fine spiritualism. The subtlest scholasticism is not more subtle than Dante. It is perhaps a bold assertion, but what we have here on these transcendent subjects, in the vast theory of Aquinas, of which the essence and sum is not the Paradise of Dante? Dante, perhaps, though resting to a great extent the popular conception of Heaven, is as much by his innate sublimity above it, as Thomas himself.¹

I find the Anglo-Saxon description of Paradise, from the *de Phosake*, added to Lactantius, in the Exeter book by Thorpe, p. 197.

I am disposed to cite a description of Paradise according to its ordinary notion, almost the only possible conception — life without any of its — from a Poet older than Chaucer: —

There is lyf withoute any deth,
 And ther is youthe withoute any elde,
 And ther is alle manner welth to welde:
 And ther is reste without any travaille —
 And ther is pees without any strife,
 And ther is alle manere likynge of lif —
 And ther is bright noon er ever to be:
 And ther is nevere wynter in that cuntree;

And ther is more worshipe and honour,
Than ever hadde kynge other emperour.
And ther is greter melodies of aungeles songe,
And ther is preysing him amonge.
And ther is alle maner friendshipes that may be,
And ther is evere perfect love and charitie;
And ther is wisdom without folye:
And ther is honeste without vilenage.
All these a man may joyes of Hevene call,
As yatte the most sovereign joye of alle
Is the sight of Goddes bright face,
In whom resteth alle manere grace.

Richard of Hampels, quoted from MSS. by Turner. *Hist. of England*, v. 232.

CHAPTER III.

LATIN LETTERS.

LATIN CHRISTIANITY might seem to prolong, to perpetuate, the reign of Latin letters over the mind of man. Without Christianity, the language of Cicero, of Virgil, and of Tacitus, might have expired with the empire of Julius, of Augustus, and of Trajan. At the German invasion it must have broken up into barbarous and shifting dialects, as the world into barbarous and conflicting kingdoms. But as the language of religion, it continued to be the language of letters, for letters were almost entirely confined to those who alone could write books or read books, religious men. Through the clergy, the secretaries as it were of mankind, it was still the language of business, of law, of public affairs, of international treaties and private compacts, because it was the only common language, and because the ecclesiastics, the masters of that language, were from this and from causes already traced, the ministers of kings, the compilers of codes of law, mostly the notaries of all more important transactions. It only broke down gradually ; it never, though defaced by barbarisms and foreign terms and forms of speech, by changing grammar and by the introduction of new words, fell into desuetude. It even just before its abrogation re-

Maintained
by Christ-
ianity.

vived in something approaching to purity, and resumed within its own, and that no narrow sphere, its old established authority. The period at which Latin ceased to be the spoken language, in which the preacher addressed his flock, the magistrate the commonalty, the demagogue the populace, was of course different in different countries, especially in the Romance and Teutonic divisions of mankind. This may hereafter be the subject of very difficult, obscure, it must be feared, unsatisfactory inquiry.

But if Latin was the language of public affairs, it was even more exclusively so that of letters. Not only all theologians, for a time all poets (at least those whose poetry was written), still longer all historians, to the end all philosophers, wrote in Latin. Christian literature however arose, not only when Latin letters had passed their meridian, but after their short day of glory and strength had sunk into exhaustion. The universal empire of Rome had been fatal to her letters. Few, indeed, of her best early writers had been Roman by birth; but they were Italians, and submitted to the spell of Roman ascendancy. Even under the Emperors, Gaul and Spain began to furnish Latin poets and writers: for a short time Rome subdued them to the rules of her own grammar and the purer usages of her speech. But in the next century Latin letters, excepting only among the great jurisprudents, seem almost to have given place to Greek. They awoke again profoundly corrupt; the barbarizing Augustan historians sink into the barbarous Ammianus Marcellinus. Africa becomes a prolific but dissonant school of heathen and of Christian writers; from some of the Panegyrist, who were Gallic rhetoricians, low enough in style, the

fall is rapid and extreme to Hilary of Poitiers. Yet even in this respect Latin owes its vitality, and almost its Latinity, to Christian writers. Augustine and Jerome, though their Latin is very different from that of Livy or of Cicero, have a kind of dexterous management, a vigorous mastery, and a copiousness of language, unrivalled in their days. Sulpicius Severus surpasses in style any later historical work; Salvian is better than the Panegyrists. The Octavius of Minucius Felix has more of the older grace and correctness than any treatise of the day. Heathenism, or Indifferentism, strangely enough, kept up the Pagan supremacy in poetry alone; Claudian, and even the few lines of Merobaudes, stand higher in purity, as in the life, of poetry, than all the Christian hexametrists.

Latin letters, therefore, having become the absolute exclusive property of the clergy, theology, of course, took the first place, and almost absorbed into itself every other branch of literature. Oratory was that of the pulpit, philosophy was divinity in another form. Even poetry taught theology, or at its highest celebrated the holy exploits of hermits or monks, of saints and martyrs; and so it was through centuries, theology once having assumed, held its unshaken supremacy over letters.

But at the time of Nicolas V. became manifest the great revolution within Latin Christianity itself, which was eventually to be fatal, at least to her universal dominion. The great system of scholastic theology, the last development of that exclusive Hierarchical science, which had swallowed up all other sciences, of which philosophy was but a subject

Scholasticism.

province, and dialectics an humble instrument, found itself, instead of the highest knowledge and the sole consummate dictatorial learning of the world, no more than the retired and self-exiled study of a still decreasing few, the professional occupation of a small section of the reading and inquiring world. Its empire had visibly passed away — its authority was shaken. In its origin, in its objects, in its style, in its immeasurable dimensions, in its scholasticism in short, this all-ruling Theology had been monastic; it had grown up in cloisters and in schools. There, men of few wants, and those wants supplied by rich endowments, in the dignity which belonged to the acknowledged leading intellects of the age, could devote to such avocations their whole undisturbed, undivided lives — lives, at least, in which nothing interfered with the quiet, monotonous, undistracting religious services. But Theology, before it would give up its tenacious hold on letters, must become secular; it must emancipate itself from scholasticism, from monasticism. It was not till after that first revolution that the emancipation of letters from theology was to come.

Our history, before it closes, must survey the immense, and, notwithstanding its infinite variety and complexity of detail, the harmonious edifice of Latin theology.¹ We must behold its strife, at times success-

¹ That survey must of necessity be rapid, and, as rapid, imperfect; nor can I boast any extensive or profound acquaintance with these ponderous tomes. The two best guides which I have been able to find (both have read, studied, profited by their laborious predecessors) are Ritter, in the volumes of his *Christliche Philosophie*, which embrace this part of his history; and an excellent *Treatise* by M. Haureau, *de la Philosophie Scolastique Mémoire Couronné par l'Académie*, 2 tomes, Paris, 1850.

In England we have no guide. Dr. Hampden, who, from his article in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, on Thomas Aquinas, promised to be the

ful, always obstinate, with philosophy — its active and skilful employment of the weapons of philosophy, of dialectics, against their master — its constant effort to be at once philosophy and theology; the irruption of Aristotelianism and of the Arabic philosophy, of which the Church did not at first apprehend all the perilous results, and in her pride supposed that she might bind to her own service; the culmination of the whole system in the five great schoolmen, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham. All this scholasticism was purely Latin — no Teutonic element entered into the controversies of the philosophizing theologians. In England, in Germany, the schools and the monasteries were Latin; the disputants spoke no other tongue. The theology which aspired to be philosophy would not condescend to, could not indeed as yet have found expression in the undeveloped vulgar languages.¹

Our history has already touched on the remoter ancestors of the Scholastic theology, on the solitary Scotus Erigena, who stands as a lonely beacon in his dark and turbulent times, and left none, or but remote, followers. The philosophy of Erigena was what the empire of Charlemagne had been, a vast organization, out of the wreck of which rose later schools. He was by anticipation or tradition (from him Berengar, as has been shown, drew his rationalizing Eucharistic system), by his genius, by his Greek or Oriental acquirements, by his translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius, a Platonist,

English historian of this remarkable chapter in the history of the human mind, has sunk into a quiet Bishop.

¹ Die Philosophie des Mittelalters gehört nicht der Zeiten an wo das Deutsche Element die Herrschaft hatte, sie ist vorherrschend Romanische Natur. - Ritter, p. 37.

or more than a Platonist; at length by his own fearless fathoming onwards into unknown depths, a Pantheist. We have dwelt on Anselm, in our judgment the real parent of mediæval theology — of that theology, which at the same time that it lets loose the reason, reins it in with a strong hand; on the intellectual insurrection, too, under Abélard, and its suppression. Anselm's lofty enterprise, the reconciliation of divinity and philosophy, had been premature; it had ended in failure.¹ Abélard had been compelled to submit his rebellious philosophy at the feet of authority. His fate for a time, to outward appearance at least, crushed the bold truths which lay hid in his system. Throughout the subsequent period theology and philosophy are contesting occasionally the bounds of their separate domains — bounds which it was impossible to mark with vigor and precision. Metaphysics soared into the realm of Theology; Theology when it came to Ontology, to reason on the being of God, could not but be metaphysical. At the same time, or only a few years later than Abélard, a writer, by some placed on a level, or even raised to superiority, as a philosophical thinker over Abélard, Gilbert de la Porée, through the abstruseness, perhaps obscurity of his teaching, the dignity of his position as Bishop, and his blameless character, was enabled to tread this border ground, if not without censure, without persecution.

But below that transcendental region, in which the mind treated of Being in the abstract, of the primary elements of thought, of the very first conception of God, Theology, in her proper sphere, would not endure

¹ L'entreprise de S. Anselme avait échoué; personne n'avait pu concilier la philosophie et la théologie. — Haureau, i. p. 318.

the presence of her dangerous rival. Theology, rightly so called, professed to be primarily grounded on the Scriptures, but on the Scriptures interpreted, commented on, supplemented by a succession of writers (the Fathers), by decrees of Councils, and what was called the authority of the Church. The ecclesiastical law had now taken the abbreviated form of a code, rather a manual, under Ivo of Chartres. So Theology was to be cast into short authoritative sentences, which might be at once the subject and the rule of controversy, the war-law of the schools. If Philosophy presumed to lay its profane hands on these subjects, it was warned off as trespassing on the manor of the Church. Logic might lend its humble ministrations to prove in syllogistic form those canonized truths; if it proceeded further, it became a perilous and proscribed weapon.

Peter the Lombard was, as it were, the Euclid of this science. His sentences were to be the irrefragable axioms and definitions from which were to be deduced all the higher and more remote truths of divinity; on them the great theological mathematicians built what appeared their infallible demonstrations.

Peter the Lombard was born near Novara, the native place of Lanfranc and of Anselm. He was Bishop of Paris in 1159. His famous book of the Sentences was intended to be, and became to a great extent, the Manual of the Schools. Peter knew not, or disdainfully threw aside, the philosophical cultivation of his day. He adhered rigidly to all which passed for Scripture, and was the authorized interpretation of the Scripture, to all which had become the creed in the traditions, and law in the decretals, of the Church. He seems to have no apprehen-

sion of doubt in his stern dogmatism ; he will not recognize any of the difficulties suggested by philosophy ; he cannot, or will not, perceive the weak points of his own system. He has the great merit that, opposed as he was to the prevailing Platonism, throughout the Sentences the ethical principle predominates ; his excellence is perspicuity, simplicity, definiteness of moral purpose. His distinctions are endless, subtile, idle ; but he wrote from conflicting authorities to reconcile writers at war with each other, at war with themselves. Their quarrels had been wrought to intentional or unintentional antagonism in the " Sic et Non " of Abélard. That philosopher, whether Pyrrhonist or more than Pyrrhonist, had left them in all the confusion of strife ; he had set Fathers against Fathers, each Father against himself, the Church against the Church, tradition against tradition, law against law. The Lombard announced himself and was accepted as the mediator, the final arbiter in this endless litigation ; he would sternly fix the positive, proscribe the negative or sceptical view in all these questions. The litigation might still go on, but within the limits which he had rigidly established ; he had determined those ultimate results against which there was no appeal. The mode of proof might be interminably contested in the schools ; the conclusion was already irrefragably fixed. On the sacramental system Peter the Lombard is loftily, severely hierarchical. Yet he is moderate on the power of the keys : he holds only a declaratory power of binding and loosing—of showing how the souls of men were to be bound and loosed.¹

¹ Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit, quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi et ligandi, i. e. ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos, quoted by

From the hard and arid system of Peter the Lombard the profound devotion of the Middle Ages took refuge in Mysticism. But it is an error to suppose Mysticism as the perpetual antagonist of Scholasticism; the Mystics were often severe Logicians; the Scholastics had all the passion of Mystics. Nor were the Scholastics always Aristotelians and Nominalists, or the Mystics, Realists and Platonists. The logic was often that of Aristotle, the philosophy that of Plato. Hugo and Richard de St. Victor (the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris) were the great Mystics of this period. The mysticism of Hugo de St. Victor withdrew the contemplator altogether from the outward to the inner world—from God in the works of nature to God in his workings on the soul of man. This contemplation of God, the consummate perfection of man, is immediate, not mediate. Through the Angels and the Celestial Hierarchy of the Areopagite it aspires to one God, not in his Theophany, but in his inmost essence. All ideas and forms of things are latent in the human soul, as in God, only they are manifested to the soul by its own activity, its meditative power. Yet St. Victor is not exempt from the grosser phraseology of the Mystic—the tasting God, and other degrading images from the senses of men. The ethical system of Hugo de St. Victor is that of the Church, more free and lofty than the dry and barren discipline of Peter Lombard:¹ it looks to the end and object,

Hugo de
St. Victor.

Ritter, p. 499. Ritter's account of the Lombard appears to me, as compared with the Book of Sentences, so just and sagacious, that I have adopted implicitly his conclusions, to a certain extent his words.

¹ *Contemplatio est illa vivacitas intelligentiæ, quæ cuncta palam Patris manifestâ visione comprehendit.* — M. In Eccles. i. p. 55, quoted by Ritter, p. 538.

not merely to the punctilious performance of Church works. Richard de St. Victor was at once ^{Richard de St. Victor.} more logical and more devout; raising higher at once the unassisted power of man, yet with even more supernatural interference — less ecclesiastical, more religious.¹ Thus the silent, solemn cloister was as it were constantly balancing the noisy and pugnacious school. The system of the St. Victorians is the contemplative philosophy of deep-thinking minds in their profound seclusion, not of intellectual gladiators: it is that of men following out the train of their own thoughts, not perpetually crossed by the objections of subtle rival disputants. Its end is not victory, but the inward satisfaction of the soul. It is not so much conscious of ecclesiastical restraint, it is rather self-restrained by its inborn reverence; it has no doubt, therefore no fear; it is bold from the inward consciousness of its orthodoxy.

John of Salisbury, though he professed to be of the school of the St. Victorians, had something of ^{John of Salisbury.} the practical English character. He was far less of a Monk, more of an observant man of the world. The Mystic was lost in the high churchman. He was the right hand and counsellor of Becket, though, like Becket, he says hard things of the Pope and of Rome; he was the inflexible assertor of the rights of the Church. John has the fullest faith in the theological articles of the Church, with some academic scepticism on the philosophic questions. John was neither of the cloister nor of the school: he has some-

¹ Ritter has drawn the distinction between these two writers with great skill and nicety.

thing of the statesman, even something of the natural philosopher.

Scholastic philosophy has no great name during the last quarter of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century. But during this barren and mute period came gradually and silently stealing in, from an unobserved unsuspected quarter, new views of knowledge, new metaphysical modes of thought, which went up into the primal principles of theology; dialectic processes, if not new, more perfect. Greek books, as yet unknown, are now in the hands of the studious; works of Aristotle, either entirely lost for centuries, or imperfectly known in the abstracts of Augustine, of Boethius, and Martianus Capella. It was from the Arabic language, from the godless and accursed Mohammedans, that Christendom received these inauspicious gifts.

This Mohammedan, or Græco-Mohammedan philosophy, was as far removed from the old stern inflexible Unitarianism of the Korân as the Korân from the Gospel. Philosophy was in truth more implacably oppugnant, a more flagrant heresy to Islam than to mediæval Christianity. Islam, like Christianity, the Latin hierarchical Christianity, had its Motakhelim, its high churchmen; its Sufis, its mystic monks; its Maatizali, its heretics or dissidents: its philosophers, properly so called, its Aristotelians. But the philosophic schools of Islam were as much or more foreign to the general Mohammedan mind than the scholastic oligarchy of Christendom to that of Western Europe. In the general estimation they were half or more than half heretical, the intellectual luxuries of splendid Courts and

Caliphs, who were, at least, no longer rigid Islamists.¹ It was not, as in Europe, the philosophy of a great hierarchy.

Of all curious chapters in the history of the human mind, none is more singular than the growth, ^{Arabic} progress, and influence of the Arabo-Aristo-^{Philosophy.} telian philosophy.² Even in the second century after the Hegira, more fully in the third, this science found its way among the Mohammedans of Syria. After having made its circuit, five or six centuries later it came out again in Spain, and from the schools of Cordova entered into the Universities of France and Italy. In both cases it was under the same escort, that of medicine, that it subjugated in turn Islam and Christianity. Physicians were its teachers in Damascus and Bagdad, in Paris and Auxerre.

The Arabians in their own country, in their free wild life, breathing the desert air, ever on horseback, had few diseases or only diseases peculiar to their habits. With the luxuries, the repose, the indolence, the residence in great cities, the richer diet of civilization, they could not avoid the maladies of civilization. They were obliged to call in native science to their aid. As in their buildings, their coinage, and most handicraft works, they employed Greek or Syrian art, so

¹ Mahomet is made to prophesy in as stern language as the fiercest Catholic. *Mon église sera divisée en plus de soixantedix sectes: il n'y a qu'une qui sera sauvée, les autres iront à l'enfer; or ce qu'il a prédit, est arrivé.* — Schmolders, p. 89.

² On ne pourra parler d'une philosophie Arabe dans le sens strict du mot. . . . On n'entend dire autre chose que la Philosophie Grecque, telle que les Arabes la cultivaient. — Schmolders, *Essai sur les Ecoles Philosophiques des Arabes*, p. 41.

Again,

“*Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit.*”

medicine was introduced and cultivated among them by Syrians, Greeks, and Jews. They received those useful strangers not only with tolerant respect, but with high and grateful honor. The strangers brought with them not only their medical treatises, the works of Hippocrates and Galen, and besides these the Alexandrian astronomy, which developed itself in the general Asiatic mind into astrology;¹ but at length also and by degrees the whole Greek philosophy, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria and the Aristotelian dialectics of Greece. The assertors of the one Book, the destroyers as they are said to have been of all books but that one, became authors so prolific, not in poetry alone, their old pride and delight, but in the infinite variety and enormous mass of their philosophic treatises, as to equal if not surpass the vast and almost incalculable volumes of Scholastic divinity.²

As in Syria of old, so now in France and other parts of Christendom, Philosophy stole in under the protection of medicine. It was as physicians that the famous Arabian philosophers, as well as some Jews, acquired unsuspected fame and authority. There is not a philosopher who has not some connection with medicine, nor a physician who has not some connection with phi-

¹ Diese Ansicht der Dinge, welche das Geschehen auf der Erde mit den Bewegungen des Himmels in einen physischen Zusammenhang bringt, ist ein charakteristischer Zug, welcher durch alle Lehre der Arabischen Aristotelischer hindurch geht. Wenn auch schon vor ihnen Astrologische Lehren auf die Philosophie einen Einfluss geübt hatten, so bildeten doch sie zuerst die Astrologie zu einem philosophischen Systeme aus. — Ritter, viii. p. 161. The Astrology of the Middle Ages no doubt owes much to and is a sign of the prevalence of the Arabic philosophy.

² La masse des prétendus Philosophes est si grande, leurs ouvrages sont numériquement si prodigieux, que toute la Scholastique est bien pauvre en comparaison des Arabes. — Schmolders. Has this learned author calculated or weighed the volumes of the Schoolmen?

losophy. The translators of the most famous philosophers, of Averrhoes and Avicenna, were physicians; metaphysics only followed in the train of physical science.¹

The Græco-Arabic philosophy worked into the system of the schools in two different modes:—I. The introduction of works of Aristotle, either unknown or now communicated in a more perfect form. II. The Arabic philosophy, which had now grown to its height under the Abbasside Caliphs in the East, Almanzor, Haroun al Raschid, Motakem,² and under the Omniades in Spain. The Eastern school, after Alghazil and Fakhreddin Rhazis, had culminated in Avicenna the Western in Averrhoes. Schools had arisen in Cordova, Seville, Toledo, Grenada, Xativa, Valencia, Murcia, Almeria. Averrhoes had an endless race of successors.

Profound, it might seem almost impenetrable darkness, covered the slow, silent interpenetration of both these influences into the Christian ^{Aristotelian} ^{Philosophy.} schools. How, through what channels, did Aristotle rise to his ascendancy? to what extent were the Schoolmen acquainted with the works of the Arabian philosophers? The first at least of these questions has found a satisfactory solution.³ During all the earlier period,

¹ Ritter, p. 676.

² The Nestorian Churches in Persia and Khorasan were instrumental to the progress of philosophizing Islamism.

³ This question has been, if I may so say, judicially determined by M. Jourdain, *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote*, new edition, revised by his son, Paris, 1843. These are the general conclusions of M. Jourdain: I. That the only works of Aristotle known in the West until the twelfth century were the Treatises on Logic, which compose the Organon. (The Analytics, Topics, and Sophistic Refutations are more rarely cited.) II. That from the date of the following

from Anselm and Abélard to the time of Albert the Great, from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, the name of Aristotle was great and authoritative in the West, but it was only as the teacher of logic, as the master of Dialectics. Even this logic, which may be traced in the darkest times, was chiefly known in a secondary form, through Augustine, Boethius¹ and the *Isagoge* of Porphyry; at the utmost, the *Treatises* which form the *Organon*, and not the whole of these, were known in the Church. It was as dangerously proficient in the Aristotelian logic, as daring to submit theology to the rules of Dialectics, that Abélard excited the jealous apprehensions of St. Bernard.² Throughout the intermediate period, to Gilbert de la Porée, to the St. Victors, to John of Salisbury, to Alain de Lille, to Adelard of Bath, Aristotle was the logician and no more.³ Of his *Morals*, his *Metaphysics*, his *Physics*, his *Natural History*, there is no knowledge whatever. His fame as a great, universal philosopher hardly lived, or lived only in obscure and doubtful tradition.

On a sudden, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, there is a cry of terror from the Church, in the centre of the most profound theological learning of the

century, the other parts of his philosophy were translated into Latin. III. That of those Translations some were from a Greek, some from an Arabic text. M. Jourdain fairly examines and states the names of former writers on the subject, — Brucker, Tiedemann, Buhle, Tenneman, Heeren.

¹ On the books translated by Boethius and the earlier Translations, Jourdain, pp. 30, 52, &c.

² See vol. iv. B. viii. c. 5. Compare Jourdain, p. 24. Abélard confesses his ignorance of the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. *Quæ quidem opera ipsius nullus adhuc translata linguæ Latinæ aptavit: ideoque minus natura eorum nobis est cognita.* — Abelard. *Oper. Ined.* p. 200.

³ The name of Aristotle is not to be found in Peter the Lombard. — Jourdain, 29.

Church, the University of Paris, and the cry is the irrefragable witness to the influence of what was vaguely denounced as the philosophy of Aristotle. It is not now presumptuous Dialectics, which would submit theological truth to logical system, but philosophical theories, directly opposed to the doctrines of the Church; the clamor is loud against certain fatal books¹ but newly brought into the schools.² Simon of Tournay,³ accused of utter infidelity, may have employed the perilous weapons of Dialectics to perplex his hearers and confute his adversaries; but he was also arraigned as having been led into his presumptuous tenets by the study of the *Physics* and *Metaphysics* of Aristotle. The heresies of Amaury de Bene, and of David of Dinant, were traced by the theologians of Paris to the same fertile source of evil. An exhumation of the remains of Amaury de Bene, who, though suspected, had been buried in consecrated ground, was followed by a condemnation of his followers, the teachers of these dreaded opinions. Some were degraded and made over to the secular arm (to the State), some to perpetual

¹ These books are said by the continuator of Rigord, William the Breton, to have contained the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle; and in two other writers of the period, in Cæsar of Heisterbach, and Hugh the Continuator of the *Chronicle of Auxerre*, to have been the *Physics*. The Decree for burning the books (see below) determines the point.

² Crevier, t. i. p. 338, or rather Du Boulay, asserted that these books had been brought from Constantinople about 1167, and translated into Latin. M. Jourdain, Note, p. 46, has shown the inaccuracy of this statement.

³ Simon of Tournay delivered with wonderful applause a Lecture, in which he explained or proved all the great Mysteries of religion by the Aristotelic process. "Stay," he closed his Lecture; "to-morrow I will utterly confute all that I have proved to-day by stronger arguments." He was struck on that morrow with apoplexy, and lost his speech. — Crevier, i. p. 309. It should seem that Simon de Tournay was rather an expert dialectician than an inquiring philosopher.

imprisonment. There was a solemn prohibition against the reading and copying of these books ; all the books which could be seized were burned.¹ Six years after, Robert de Courçon, the Papal Legate, interdicted the reading of the Physics and Metaphysics of Aristotle in the schools of Paris.² A milder decree of Gregory IX. ordered that they should not be used till they had been corrected by the theologians of the Church ; yet two years before this Gregory had fulminated a violent Bull against the presumption of those who taught the Christian doctrine rather according to the rules of Aristotle than the traditions of the Fathers,³ against the profane usage of mingling up philosophy with Divine revelation. But the secret of all this terror and perplexity of the Church was not that the pure and more rational philosophy of Aristotle was revealed in the schools ; the evil and the danger more clearly denounced were in the Arabian Comment, which, inseparable from the Arabo-Latin translation, had formed a system fruitful of abuse and error.⁴

¹ All kinds of incongruous charges were heaped on the memory of Amaury de Bene: he was an Albigensian, believed in the Eternal Gospel.

² See the Decree of the Archbishop of Sens and the Council, unknown to Lannoi and earlier authors, Martene, Nov. Thes. Anec. iv. 166. *Corpus Magistri Amaurici extrahatur a cemeterio et projiciatur in terram non benedictam et idem excommunicetur per omnes ecclesias totius provinciae. A list of names follows, isti degradentur, penitus sæculari curiæ reliquendi; another list, perpetuo carceri mancipandi. The Books of David de Dinant are to be burned, nec libri Aristotelis de Naturali Philosophia, nec Commenta legantur Parisiis publice vel secreto.*

³ Non legantur libri Aristotelis de Metaphysicâ et Naturali Philosophiâ nec summa de eisdem, aut de doctrinâ Mag. David de Dinant, aut Almerici heretici, aut Mauricii Hispan. — Stat. Univ. Par.

⁴ On voit dans ces trois condamnations une diminution successive de sévérité. La première est la plus rigoureuse, les autres s'en vont s'adoucissant. Crevier blames this mildness, p. 312.

The heresy of Amaury de Bene, and that of David de Dinant, was Pantheism.¹ The Creator and the Creation were but one; all flowed from God, all was to be reabsorbed in God — a doctrine not less irreconcilable with genuine Aristotelism than with the doctrine of the Church.² But the greater Schoolmen of the next period aspired, with what success it may be doubted, to the nobler triumph of subjugating Aristotelism to the science of Theology, not the logical science only, but the whole range of the Stagirite's philosophy.³ It was to be an obsequious and humble, though honored ally, not a daring rival; they would set free, yet at the same time bind its stubborn spirit in their firm grasp, to more than amity, to perfect harmony.

Albert the Great, in his unbounded range of knowledge, comprehends the whole metaphysical, moral, physical, as well as logical system of Aristotle.⁴ He had read all, or, with but few unimportant exceptions, his whole works. He had read them in Latin, some translated directly from the Greek, some from the Arabic; some few had been translated from the Arabic into Hebrew, and from the Hebrew into the Latin. Those which came through the Arabic retain distinct and undeniable marks of their transmission — Arabic words, especially words untranslated, Arabic idioms, and undeniable vestiges of the Arabic vowel system.⁵

¹ Roger Bacon nous apprend que l'on s'opposa long temps à Paris à la philosophie naturelle et à la métaphysique d'Aristote *exposées par Avicenne et Averroës*; ceux qui s'en servaient furent excommuniés. — P. 194. See the following quotation from Roger Bacon, and the whole passage.

² See the sources of their doctrines, Jourdain, p. 196.

³ See in Jourdain the works cited by William Bishop of Paris, who died 1248. — P. 31.

⁴ Works quoted by Albert the Great also, p. 32.

⁵ Jamais une version dérivée d'un texte Arabe ne présenta, fidèlement

These versions from the Arabic came : I. From Spain and from Spanish scholars in the South of France, at Marseilles, Montpellier, Toulouse. II. From Sicily, where Frederic II. had fostered Arabic learning, and had encouraged translations from that tongue. Under his auspices the famous Michael Scott had translated, at least, the books of Natural History.¹ Besides these some had come through the Hebrew ; the great age of Jewish philosophy, that of Aben-Esra, Maimonides, and Kimchi, had been contemporaneous with the later Spanish school of Arabic philosophy. There had been an intercommunion or rivalry in the cultivation of the whole range of philosophy. The translations from the Greek were as yet few, imperfect, inaccurate.² The greater Thomas Aquinas has the merit of having encouraged and obtained a complete translation of the works of Aristotle directly from the Greek.³ The cultivation of Greek had never entirely ceased in the West. After Scotus Erigena and Adelard of Bath

orthographié, un mot qui aura passé par l'intermédiaire de l'Arabe, langue où la prononciation n'est réglée que par les points diacritiques qui sont rarement bien placés. Souvent aussi les traducteurs ne connaissant pas la valeur d'un terme l'ont laissé en Arabe. — Jourdain, p. 19. See the whole passage, and also p. 37.

¹ On the translation by M. Scott, from the Arabic, not through the Hebrew, Jourdain, p. 124, *et seq.*, and Herman Alemannus, with whom the older Herman Contractus (the Lame) has been confounded. — Jourdain, p. 93.

² Among the earliest Translations from the Greek was the Nicomachean Ethics, by no less a man than Robert Grosstête, Bishop of Lincoln. M. Jourdain satisfactorily proves this remarkable fact. — P. 59, *et seq.*

³ *Scripsit etiam super philosophiam naturalem et moralem et super metaphysicam, quorum librorum procuravit ut fieret nova translatio quæ sententiæ Aristotelis contineret clarius veritatem.* — Tocco. Vit. C. Th. Aquin. Act. SS. March. On sait que ce fut par les conseils et les soins de S. Thomas d'Aquin que fut faite une traduction Latine d'Aristote. — Tenneman, Manuel, French Translation.

travelled in the East, these casual and interrupted communications grew into more regular and constant intercourse. But now the Latin conquest of Constantinople had made Eastern and Western Christendom one. If the conquering army, the sovereign and the territorial lords, did not condescend to acquire much of the language of their subjects, the conquering Church was more wise and enterprising. Innocent III. proposed to the University of Paris to send a colony of scholars to learn the tongue of the people, among whom the Latin clergy was to administer the rites of the Church;¹ a school for youths from Constantinople was to be opened at Paris.² No doubt many Byzantine exiles, men of peace and learning, found their way to the West. The Mendicant Orders, spreading over the world, made it their duty and their boast to acquire foreign tongues; and now especially the Dominicans aspired to the highest places in learning and knowledge. Thus the complete and genuine Aristotle was divulged. Towards the end of the thirteenth century the philosophers of Greece and Rome were as well known, as in our own days; the schools rung with their names,³ with the explanation of their writings. A scholastic Doctor was not thought worthy of his name who had not publicly commented on their writings.⁴ It was not alone as a servile translator of the Greek, as the inert and uninventive disciple of the Western philosophy, which Arabian Philosophy.

¹ Epistolæ Innocent. III. Brequigny et Du Theil, ii. 712, 723.

² Buleus, iii. iv.

³ The earlier Western students, who travelled before the twelfth century, Constantine the Monk, the famous Gerbert, Adelard of Bath, sought rather mathematical or astronomical science.

⁴ Jourdain, p. 2.

it was to restore to its forgotten honors in the West, that Arabian Philosophy aspired, if not to rule, to influence the mind of Christendom.¹ The four great Arabic authors, Avicenna, Aven Pace, Avicembron, Averrhoes, with David the Jew, and others of less fame,² introduced, chiefly perhaps through the Jews of Andalusia, Marseilles, and Montpellier (those Dragomans of Mediæval Science), are not only known to the later Schoolmen ; but even the suspicion, the jealousy, the awe, has fallen away. They are treated with courtesy and respect, allowed fair hearing ; that which at the beginning of the century appeared so perilous, so formidable, is no longer the forbidden lore of heretics, of unbelievers, of atheists. The Arabians are entertained as grave philosophers ; their theories are examined, their arguments discussed. Their authority, as representatives of a lofty and commanding philosophy, which has a right to respectful attention, is fully acknowledged.³ Avicenna and Averrhoes are placed by Dante among the philosophers who wanted only baptism to be saved ; and Dante no doubt learned his respect for their names from his master, St. Thomas.⁴

The extent to which Latin Christianity, in its high-

¹ See Jourdain on the Translations from the Arabic, by Dominic and John the Jew, in the twelfth century.

² Ajoutons que les philosophes Arabes, Avicenne, Averroes, Aven Pace, etc., oubliés maintenant, jouissaient alors d'une grande réputation. — *Ibid.*

³ M. Schmolders is of opinion that the Schoolmen were much more indebted to the Græco-Arabic philosophy than is generally supposed. L'influence exercée par eux sur le Scholastique est beaucoup plus grande qu'on ne la suppose ordinairement. Non seulement les Scholastiques semblent en convenir eux-mêmes à cause de leurs nombreuses citations, mais il n'est pas difficile de prouver qu'ils sont redevables aux Arabes d'une foule d'idées, qu'on leur a jusqu'à présent attribuées. — P. 104.

⁴ *Inferno*, iv. This shows at once their fame, and that Arabic philosophers were not popularly rejected as impious and godless.

est scholasticism, admitted, either avowedly or tacitly, consciously or imperceptibly, the influence of the philosophy of Bagdad or Cordova, how far reached this fusion of refined Islamism and Christianity, our History wants space, the Historian knowledge of the yet unfathomed depths of Arabian learning, to determine.¹

Now came the great age of the Schoolmen. Latin Christianity raised up those vast monuments of Theology which amaze and appall the mind

Great era
of Scholas-
ticism.

with the enormous accumulation of intellectual industry, ingenuity, and toil;² but of which the sole result to posterity is this barren amazement. The tomes of Scholastic Divinity may be compared with the pyramids of Egypt, which stand in that rude majesty, which is commanding from the display of immense human power, yet oppressive from the sense of the waste of that power for no discoverable use. Whoever penetrates within, finds himself bewildered and lost in a labyrinth of small, dark, intricate passages and chambers, devoid of grandeur, devoid of solemnity: he may wander without end, and find nothing! It was not

¹ I almost presume, as far as my own reading extends, to doubt whether there are sufficient grounds as yet for deciding this question. It requires a profound knowledge of Oriental and of Mediæval lore in one person. M. Schmolders possesses the first, M. Ritter perhaps a large proportion of both. M. Haureau, the great Master of Scholasticism, rather declines, at least does not fully enter into the discussion.

² The study of Arabic, which had been fostered by Frederick II., carried to high perfection by Michael Scott and others, was not discouraged in the Universities. Honorius IV. proposed an endowment for this study in the University of Paris. The ostensible object was the education of Missionaries to propagate the Gospel among the Islamites. The foundation did not take place till the Council of Vienne. — Crevier, ii. 112. At an early period, perhaps, it might rather have promoted the invasion of Christianity by the Arabic philosophy.

indeed the enforced labor of a slave population: it was rather voluntary slavery, submitting in its intellectual ambition and its religious patience to monastic discipline: it was the work of a small intellectual oligarchy, monks, of necessity, in mind and habits; for it imperiously required absolute seclusion either in the monastery or in the University, a long life under monastic rule. No Schoolman could be a great man but as a Schoolman. William of Ockham alone was a powerful demagogue — scholastic even in his political writings, but still a demagogue. It is singular to see every kingdom in Latin Christendom, every Order in the social State, furnishing the great men, not merely to the successive lines of Doctors, who assumed the splendid titles of the Angelical, the Seraphic, the Inrefragable, the most Profound, the most Subtile, the Invincible, even the Perspicuous,¹ but to what may be called the supreme Pentarchy of Scholasticism. Italy sent Thomas of Aquino and Bonaventura; Germany Albert the Great; the British Isles (they boasted also of Alexander Hales and Bradwardine) Duns Scotus and William of Ockham; France alone must content herself with names somewhat inferior (she had already given Abélard, Gilbert de la Porée, Amauri de Bene, and other famous or suspected names), now William of Auvergne, at a later time Durandus. Albert and Aquinas were of noble Houses, the Counts of Bollstadt and Aquino; Bonaventura of good parentage at Fidenza; of Scotus the birth was so obscure as to be untraceable; Ockham was of humble parents in the village of that name in Surrey. But

¹ Aquinas, Bonaventura, Alexander Hales, Ægidius de Colonna, Ockham, Walter Burley.

France may boast that the University of Paris was the great scene of their studies, their labors, their instruction: the University of Paris was the acknowledged awarder of the fame and authority obtained by the highest Schoolmen. It is no less remarkable that the new Mendicant Orders sent forth these five Patriarchs, in dignity, of the science. Albert and Aquinas were Dominicans, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, Ockham, Franciscans. It might have been supposed that the popularizing of religious teaching, which was the express and avowed object of the Friar Preachers and of the Minorites, would have left the higher places of abstruse and learned Theology to the older Orders, or to the more dignified Secular Ecclesiastics. Content with being the vigorous antagonists of heresy in all quarters, they would not aspire also All Mendicants. to become the aristocracy of theologic erudition. But the dominant religious impulse of the times could not but seize on all the fervent and powerful minds which sought satisfaction for their devout yearnings. No one who had strong religious ambition could be anything but a Dominican or a Franciscan; to be less was to be below the highest standard. Hence on one hand the Orders aspired to rule the Universities, contested the supremacy with all the great established authorities in the schools; and having already drawn into their vortex almost all who united powerful abilities with a devotional temperament, never wanted men who could enter into this dreary but highly rewarding service,—men who could rule the Schools, as others of their brethren had begun to rule the Councils and the minds of Kings. It may be strange to contrast the popular simple preaching, for such must have been

that of St. Dominic and St. Francis, such that of their followers, in order to contend with success against the plain and austere Sermons of the heretics, with the Sum of Theology of Aquinas, which of itself (and it is but one volume in the works of Thomas) would, as it might seem, occupy a whole life of the most secluded study to write, almost to read. The unlearned, unreasoning, only profoundly, passionately loving and dreaming St. Francis, is still more oppugnant to the intensely subtile and dry Duns Scotus, at one time carried by his severe logic into Pelagianism ; or to William of Ockham, perhaps the hardest and severest intellectualist of all ; a political fanatic, not like his visionary brethren, who brooded over the Apocalypse and their own prophets, but for the Imperial against the Papal Sovereignty.

As then in these five men culminates the age of genuine Scholasticism, the rest may be left to be designated and described to posterity by the names assigned to them by their own wondering disciples.

We would change, according to our notion, the titles which discriminated this distinguished pentarchy. Albert the Great would be the Philosopher, Aquinas the Theologian, Bonaventura the Mystic, Duns Scotus the Dialectician, Ockham the Politician. It may be said of Scholasticism, as a whole, that whoever takes delight in what may be called gymnastic exercises of the reason or the reasoning powers, efforts which never had, and hardly cared to have, any bearing on the life, or even on the sentiments and opinions of mankind, may study these works, the crowning effort of Latin, of Sacerdotal, and Monastic Christianity, and may acquire something like respect for these forgotten athletes

in the intellectual games of antiquity. They are not of so much moment in the history of religion, for their theology was long before rooted in the veneration and awe of Christendom; nor in that of philosophy, for except what may be called mythological subtilties, questions relating to the world of angels and spirits, of which, according to them, we might suppose the revelation to man as full and perfect, as that of God or of the Redeemer, there is hardly a question which has not been examined in other language and in less dry and syllogistic form. There is no acute observation on the workings of the human mind, no bringing to bear extraordinary facts on the mental, or mingled mental and corporeal, constitution of our being. With all their researches into the unfathomable they have fathomed nothing: with all their vast logical apparatus they have proved nothing to the satisfaction of the inquisitive mind. Not only have they not solved any of the insoluble problems of our mental being, our primary conceptions, our relations to God, to the Infinite, neither have they (a more possible task) shown them to be insoluble.¹

Albert the Great was born at Lauingen in Swabia, of the ancient house of the Counts of Boll-^{Albert the Great.} stadt. He studied at Paris and in Padua. ^{A.D. 1198.} In Padua, Jordan the Saxon, the head of the Dominicans, laid on him the spell of his own master-mind and that of his Order; he became a Dominican. He returned to Cologne, and taught in the schools 1211.

¹ Il est donc bien difficile aux philosophes d'avouer que la philosophie consiste plutôt à reconnaître la limite naturelle de l'intelligence humaine qu'à faire de puérils efforts pour reculer cette limite. — Haureau, ii. p. 45, quoting Locke, whose whole, wise, but strangely misrepresented work is a comment on that great axiom.

of that city. In 1228 he was called to fill the chair of his Order in the Jacobin convent at Paris. There, though his text-book was the rigid, stone-cold Sentences of Peter the Lombard, his bold originality, the confidence with which he rushed on ground yet untrodden, at once threw back all his competitors into obscurity, and seemed to summon reason, it might be to the aid, it might be as a perilous rival to religion. This, by his admirers, was held as hardly less than divine inspiration, but provoked his adversaries and his enemies. "God," it was said, "had never divulged so many of his secrets to one of his creatures." Others murmured, "He must be possessed by an evil spirit:" already the fame, the suspicion of a magician had begun to gather round his name. After three years of glory, perhaps of some danger, in Paris, he settled among his Dominican brethren at Cologne. At Cologne he was visited by the Emperor William of Holland, who bowed down in wonder before the extraordinary man. As Provincial of Germany, commissioned by the Diet of Worms, he visited all the monasteries of his jurisdiction. He severely reproved the Monks, almost universally sunk in ignorance and idleness; he rescued many precious manuscripts which in their ignorance they had left buried in dust, or in their fanaticism cast aside as profane. He was summoned to Rome, and named Grand Master of the Palace—the great dignity usually held by his Order—by Pope Alexander IV. He laid down his dignity, and retired to his school at Cologne. He was compelled to accept the Bishopric of Ratisbon. After three years of able administration he resigned to

1260.
1263. Died in 1260. Urban IV. the unwelcome greatness, and

again retired to his seclusion, his studies, and public instruction at Cologne. Such was the public life, such the honors paid to the most illustrious of the Schoolmen.¹

Albert the Great at once awed by his immense erudition and appalled his age. His name, the Universal Doctor, was the homage to his all-embracing knowledge. He quotes, as equally familiar, Latin, Greek, Arabic, Jewish philosophers.² He was the first Schoolman who lectured on Aristotle himself, on Aristotle from Græco-Latin or Arabo-Latin copies. The whole range of the Stagirite's physical and metaphysical philosophy was within the scope of Albert's teaching.³ In later days he was called the Ape of Aristotle; he had dared to introduce Aristotle into the Sanctuary itself.⁴ One of his Treatises is a refutation of the Arabian

¹ Haureau, t. ii. p. 1, *et seq.* I owe most of what follows, with references to the original works, to the two Chapters on Albert the Great in Ritter, *Christliche Philosophie*, viii. p. 181, and M. Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scolastique*, ii. p. 1. I think the German has an unusual advantage over the Frenchman in the order, and therefore in the perspicuity, with which he has developed the system of Albert the Great. In his sharp, precise language the Frenchman resumes his superiority; and it must be remembered that the object of M. Haureau's work is the Scholastic Philosophy. I have also read M. Rousselot, *Etudes*, and some of the older writers.

² Et in hanc sententiam convenerunt multi Theologi diversarum religionum tam scilicet Saracenorum quam Judæorum, quam Christianorum. — Lib. viii. *Physic.* c. vi., quoted by M. Haureau, ii. p. 54. Alexander Hales (about 1222) had illustrated Christian Theology from Aristotle and Avicenna. — Ritter, 181. Also William of Auvergne. See Haureau, p. 11.

³ The only Treatises which the Scholastic Philosopher might seem to disdain were the popular and practical ones, the Rhetoric, Poetics, and the Politics. — Ritter, p. 188.

⁴ See quotation from Thomasius in Haureau, and M. Haureau's refutation. An andern Orten giebt er zu erkennen, er wollte hier nur die Meinung der Peripatiker wiedergeben; wie dieselbe mit der Katholischen Lehre ausgeglichen werden könne, lässt er dahin gestellt seyn. Ritter, however, does full justice to his religion, p. 191. *De unitate intellectus contra Averrhoem*. His works fill twenty-one volumes folio.

Averrhoes. Nor is it Aristotle and Averrhoes alone that come within the pale of Albert's erudition; the commentators and glossators of Aristotle, the whole circle of the Arabians, are quoted, their opinions, their reasonings, even their words, with the utmost familiarity. But with Albert Theology was still the master-science. The Bishop of Ratisbon was of unimpeached orthodoxy; the vulgar only, in his wonderful knowledge of the secrets of Nature, in his studies of Natural History, could not but see something of the magician. Albert had the ambition of reconciling Plato and Aristotle, and of reconciling this harmonized Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy with Christian Divinity. He thus, in some degree, misrepresented or misconceived both the Greeks; he hardened Plato into Aristotelism, expanded Aristotelism into Platonism; and his Christianity, though Albert was a devout man, while it constantly subordinates, in strong and fervent language, knowledge to faith and love, became less a religion than a philosophy. Albert has little of, he might seem to soar above the peculiar and dominant doctrines of Christianity; he dwells on the nature of God rather than on the Trinity, on the immortality of the soul rather than the redemption; on sin, on original sin, he is almost silent. According to the established Christian theology, Creation and Redemption were simultaneously in the counsels of God. In the new system, Grace was a gift for the advancement of Man's indefeasible intellectual nature. But though Albert thus dwells on the high, as it were philosophic, Godhead, he reserves religiously for God a sole primary existence; he rejects with indignation his master Aristotle's tenet of the coeternity of matter and the eternity of the

world ;¹ but he rests not in the sublime simplicity of the Mosaic creation by the Word of God out of nothing. Since St. Augustine the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of the forms, or the ideas, of all things in the mind of God, had been almost the accredited doctrine of the Church. Even Matter was in God, but before it became material, only in its form and possibility. Man, indeed, seems to be doomed, if he can soar above the corporeal anthropomorphism which arrayed the Deity in human form (the anthropomorphism of the poets, the sculptors, and the painters), to admit an intellectual anthropomorphism ; to endeavor to comprehend and define the laws and the capacities of the Divine Intelligence according to his own.² Yet when Albert thus accepted a kind of Platonic emanation theory of all things from the Godhead,³ he repudiated as detestable, as blasphemous, the absolute unity of the Divine Intelligence with the intelligence of man. This

¹ Gott wurde bedürftig sein, wenn sein Werken eine Materie voraussetze. . . . Dass die Materie nicht ewig sein könne, wird aber auch daraus erschlossen, dass Gott, die ewige Form, und die Materie nicht mit einander gemein haben könnten, also auch nicht die Ewigkeit. Hier gebraucht Albert diesen Satz des Aristoteles gegen den Aristoteles selbst. — Ritter, pp. 201-2.

² Le Dieu des philosophes, c'est à dire des Théologiens éclairés, ne fut pas, il est vrai, celui des sculpteurs et des peintres ; mais il eut bien avec lui, pour ne rien céder, quelques traits de ressemblance. Pour représenter la figure de Dieu, l'artiste avait choisi dans la nature, avec les yeux du corps, les formes qui lui avaient semblé répondre le mieux au concept idéal de la beauté parfaite, et il s'était efforcé de les reproduire sur le bois ou sur la pierre. Pour représenter Dieu comme l'intelligence parfaite, le philosophe procéda suivant la même méthode ; arrivant au dernier terme de l'abstraction, il trouva dans l'entendement humain, les idées générales, et il ne sut alors mieux faire, que de définir l'intelligence de Dieu le lieu primordial de ces idées. — Haureau, p. 84. Compare the whole passage, as just as it is brilliant.

³ Primum principium est indefinienter fluens, quo intellectus universaliter agens indesinenter est intelligentias emittens. — Apud Ritter, p. 199.

doctrine of Averrhoes destroyed the personality of man, if not of God. He recoils from Pantheism with religious horror. His perpetual object is to draw the distinction between the Eternal and the Temporal, the Infinite and the Finite; how knowledge is attained, how the knowledge of God differs from the enthusiastic contemplation of God. God, though not to be comprehended, may be known, and that not only by grace, but by natural means. God is as the Light, everywhere seen, but everywhere escaping the comprehension of the vision. God is omnipresent, all-working, yet limited by the capacities of existing things.

God the Creator (and Creation was an eternal, inalienable attribute of the God) was conceived, as having primarily called into being four coeval things of everlasting duration, — the primal Matter, Time, Heaven, the Everlasting Intelligence.¹ But Matter, and Time, it should seem, were properly neither Matter nor Time. Matter has no proper existence, it is only privative; it is something by which and in which works Intelligence.² The Heavens exist (and in the Heavens, though this is something, as it were, apart from his theory, Albert admits the whole established order and succession of the Angels from Dionysius the

¹ Ille enim maxime intelligibilis est et omnis intellectus et intelligibilis causa et in omni intelligibili attingitur, sicut lumen quod est actus visibilium, attingitur in omni visibili per visum. Sicut tamen lumen secundum immensitatem, quam habet in rota solis et secundum immensitatem potestatis, qua omnia visibilia comprehendere potest, non potest capi vel comprehendere, a visu, ita nec intellectus divinus, secundum excellentiam, qua excellit in se ipso, et secundum potestatem quâ illustrare potest super omnia, etiam super infinita intelligibilia, capi vel comprehendere potest ab intellectu creato. *Summa Theolog.*, quoted in Ritter, p. 198. The finite cannot comprehend the Infinite. But Albert always presupposes the moral as well as the Christian preparative for knowledge, virtue, and faith.

² Ritter, p. 205.

Areopagite¹⁾ and Intelligence, which subsists, though oppressed and bowed down, even in lifeless things. But between the higher, imperishable intelligence of man and the intelligence of God there is nothing intermediate;² and yet there is eternal, irreconcilable difference. The Unity of God must develop itself in multiplicity. Man's Intelligence is a continual efflux from God, an operation of God, but yet not divine. As God it has its own Free Will.³

And so Albert goes on, and so went on Albert's successors, and so go on Albert's interpreters, with these exquisitely subtle distinctions of words, which they refuse to see are but words, making matter immaterial,⁴ forms actual beings or substances; making God himself, with perfect free-will, act under a kind of necessity; making thoughts things, subtilizing things to thoughts; beguiling themselves and beguiling mankind with the notion that they are passing the impassable barriers of human knowledge; approaching boldly, then suddenly recoiling from the most fatal conclusions. In the pride and in the delight of conscious power, in the exercise of the reason, and its wonderful

¹ The whole Universe was a progressive descendant development, and ascendant movement towards perfection.

² On the great mediæval question Albert would be at once a Realist, a Conceptualist, and a Nominalist. There were three kinds of Universals, one abstract, self-existing, one in the object, one in the mind. — Ritter, p. 219. Haureau, p. 14. M. Haureau treats this part at length.

³ Yet he does not deny, he asserts in other places, that which Christianity and Islam, Latin, Greek, and Arabian, equally admitted, the operation of God in the soul of man through Angels.

⁴ Daher ist das Sein an einem jeden Geschöpfe verschieden von dem, was es ist. — Ritter, p. 211. The matter is only the outward vehicle, as it were, — the Form gives the Being. This is the Theory of Averrhoes. See on this subject the just and sensible observation of M. Haureau, from page 34.

instrument Logic, these profound and hardy thinkers are still reproducing the same eternal problems; detaching the immaterial part of man, as it were, from his humanity, and blending him with the Godhead; bringing the Godhead down into the world, till the distinction is lost; and then perceiving and crying out in indignation against what seems their own blasphemy. The close of all Albert the Great's intense labors, of his enormous assemblage of the opinions of the philosophers of all ages, and his efforts to harmonize them with the high Christian Theology, is a kind of Eclecticism, an unreconciled Realism, Conceptualism, Nominalism, with many of the difficulties of each. The intelligence of God was but an archetype of the intelligence of man, the intelligence of man a type of that of God; each peopled with the same ideas, representatives of things, conceptional entities, even words; existing in God before all existing things, before time, and to exist after time; in man existing after existing things, born in time, yet to share in the immortality of the intelligence. Thus religion, the Christian religion, by throwing upward God into his unapproachable, ineffable, inconceivable Mystery, is, perhaps, in its own province, more philosophical than philosophy. Albert, in admitting the title of the Aristotelian or Greek, or Arabian philosophy, to scrutinize, to make comprehensible the Divine Intelligence; in attempting, however glorious the attempt, the Impossible, and affixing no limits to the power of human reason and logic, while he disturbed, to some extent unintentionally deposed, Theology, substituted no high and coherent Philosophy. Safe in his own deep religiousness, and his doctrinal orthodoxy, he saw not how with his philo-

sophic speculations he undermined the foundations of his theology.

But this view of Albert the Great is still imperfect and unjust. His title to fame is not that he introduced and interpreted the Metaphysics and Physics of Aristotle, and the works of the Arabian philosophers on these abstruse subjects to the world, but because he opened the field of true philosophic observation to mankind. In natural history he unfolded the more precious treasures of the Aristotelian philosophy, he revealed all the secrets of ancient science, and added large contributions of his own on every branch of it; in mathematics he commented on and explained Euclid; in chemistry, he was a subtle investigator; in astronomy, a bold speculator. Had he not been premature — had not philosophy been seized and again enslaved to theology, mysticism, and worldly politics — he might have been more immediately and successfully followed by the first, if not by the second, Bacon.¹

Of all the schoolmen Thomas Aquinas² has left the greatest name. He was a son of the Count ^{Thomas} of Aquino, a rich fief in the Kingdom of Na- ^{Aquinas.} ples. His mother, Theodora, was of the line of the old Norman Kings; his brothers, Reginald and Landolph, held high rank in the Imperial armies. His

¹ Nous n'avons interrogé que le philosophe; nous n'avons parcouru que trois ou quatre de ses vingt-un volumes in-folio, œuvre prodigieuse, presque surhumaine, à laquelle aucune autre ne saurait être comparée: que nous aurait appris, si nous avions eu le loisir de les consulter, le théologien formé à l'école des Pères, le scrupuleux investigateur des mystères de la nature, le chimiste subtil, l'audacieux astronome, l'habile interprète des théorèmes d'Euclide. Le résultat des travaux d'Albert n'a été rien moins qu'une véritable révolution! Cela résume tous ses titres à la gloire. — Haureau, ii. p. 103. He perhaps rather forboded than wrought this revolution.

² Born about 1227.

family was connected by marriage with the Hohenstaufens ; they had Swabian blood in their veins, and so the great schoolman was of the race of Frederick II. Monasticism seized on Thomas in his early youth ; he became an inmate of Monte Casino ; at sixteen years of age he caught the more fiery and vigorous enthusiasm of the Dominicans. By them he was sent—no unwilling proselyte and pupil—to France. He was seized by his worldly brothers, and sent back to Naples : he was imprisoned in one of the family castles, but resisted even the fond entreaties of his mother and his sisters. He persisted in his pious disobedience, his holy hardness of heart ; he was released after two years' imprisonment—it might seem strange—at the command of the Emperor Frederick II. The godless Emperor, as he was called, gave Thomas to the Church. Aquinas took the irrevocable vow of a Friar Preacher. He became a scholar of Albert the Great at Cologne and at Paris. He was dark, silent, unapproachable even by his brethren, perpetually wrapt in profound meditation. He was called, in mockery, the great dumb ox of Sicily. Albert questioned the mute disciple on the most deep and knotty points of theology ; he found, as he confessed, his equal, his superior. “That dumb ox will make the world resound with his doctrines.” With Albert the faithful disciple returned to Cologne. Again he went back to Paris, received his academic degrees, and taught with universal wonder. Under Alexander IV. he stood up in Rome in defence of his Order against the eloquent William de St. Amour ; he repudiated for his Order, and condemned by his authority, the prophecies of the Abbot Joachim. He taught at Cologne with Albert

Cologne,
1244, 1245.

the Great ; also at Paris, at Rome, at Orvieto, at Viterbo, at Perugia. Where he taught, the world listened in respectful silence. He was acknowledged by two Popes, Urban IV. and Clement IV., as the first theologian of the age. He refused the Archbishopric of Naples. He was expected at the Council of Lyons, as the authority before whom all Christendom might be expected to bow down. He died ^{March 2,} 1274. ere he had passed the borders of Naples at the Abbey of Rossa Nuova, near Terracina, at the age of forty-eight. Dark tales were told of his death ;¹ only the wickedness of man could deprive the world so early of such a wonder. The University of Paris ^{July 15,} 1828, claimed, but in vain, the treasure of his mortal remains.² He was canonized by John XXII.

Thomas Aquinas is throughout, above all, the Theologian. God and the soul of man are the only objects truly worthy of his philosophic investigation. This is the function of the Angelic Doctor, the mission of the Angel of the schools. In his works, or rather in his one great work, is the final result of all which has been decided by Pope or Council, taught by the Fathers, accepted by tradition, argued in the schools, inculcated in the Confessional. The Sum of Theology is the authentic, authoritative, acknowledged code of Latin Christianity. We cannot but contrast this vast work

¹ See vol. vi. p. 130, with the quotation from Dante. One story was that Charles of Anjou had attempted violence on a niece of St. Thomas, and that the Saint had determined to denounce the crime before the Council of Lyons; others said that Charles resented the free if not king-killing doctrines of the treatise of St. Thomas de Regimine Principum. But there is a full account of the calm, pious death of St. Thomas. He was ill more than a month, with every sign of natural decay.

² Read the remarkable letter of the University in the Life in the Bolandists.

with the original Gospel : to this bulk has grown the New Testament, or rather the doctrinal and moral part of the New Testament.¹ But Aquinas is an intellectual theologian : he approaches more nearly than most philosophers, certainly than most divines, to pure embodied intellect. He is perfectly passionless ; he has no polemic indignation, nothing of the Churchman's jealousy and suspicion ; he has no fear of the result of any investigation ; he hates nothing, hardly heresy ; loves nothing, unless perhaps naked, abstract truth. In his serene confidence that all must end in good, he moves the most startling and even perilous questions, as if they were the most indifferent, the very Being of God. God must be revealed by syllogistic process. Himself inwardly conscious of the absolute harmony of his own intellectual and moral being, he places sin not so much in the will as in the understanding. The perfection of man is the perfection of his intelligence. He examines with the same perfect self-command, it might almost be said apathy, the converse as well as the proof of the most vital religious truths. He is nearly as consummate a sceptic, almost atheist, as he is a divine and theologian. Secure, as it should seem, in impenetrable armor, he has not only no apprehension, but seems not to suppose the possibility of danger ; he has nothing of the boastfulness of self-confidence, but in calm assurance of victory, gives every advantage to his adversary. On both sides of every ques-

¹ My copy of the *Summa* of Aquinas has above twelve hundred of the very closest printed folio pages in double columns, without the indexes. I pretend not to have read it ; but whoever is curious to know, as it were, the ultimate decisions of the Latin Church on most theological or ethical points will consult it ; and will see the range and scope of that theology, and the groundwork of all the later casuistry.

tion he casts the argument into one of his clear, distinct syllogisms, and calmly places himself as Arbiter, and passes judgment in one or a series of still more unanswerable syllogisms. He has assigned its unassailable province to Church authority, to tradition or the Fathers, faith and works; but beyond, within the proper sphere of philosophy, he asserts full freedom. There is no Father, even St. Augustine, who may not be examined by the fearless intellect.

Thomas Aquinas has nothing like the boundless range of Albert the Great; he disdains or fears Natural Philosophy. Within their common sphere he is the faithful disciple of the master, but far surpasses him in clearness, distinctness, precision, conclusiveness. He had some works of Plato, unknown to Albert, acquired perhaps in his native Magna Græcia; but, with Albert, he rejects the coeternal ideas subsistent without and beyond the Deity. With Albert in that controversy he is a high Aristotelian, but repudiates as decisively the eternity of matter, the imperishability of the Universe.

Aquinas has, as it were, three distinct and unmingling worlds: the world of God, the world of the immaterial angels and demons, the world of mingled matter and intelligence, — that of man. God is alone, the One absolute, infinite, self-subsistent, whose essence it is "to be." No Eastern anti-materialist ever guarded the primal Godhead more zealously from any intrusive debasement. God is his own unique form: proceeds from no antecedent form, communicates with no inferior form. The Godhead is in itself, by itself, all that is. It is preëxistent to matter, eternally separate from matter.¹ But Thomas must never lose the Christian

¹ Compare Hauréau, p. 155.

theologian in the philosopher. All this abstract, unmingling, solitary Deity, is not merely to be endowed with his eternal, immutable attributes, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Providence, but reconciled with the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity. Thomas has not merely to avoid the errors of Plato and Aristotle, but of Arius and Sabellius; and on the Trinity he is almost as diffuse, even more minute, than on the sole original Godhead. The most microscopic eye can hardly trace his exquisite and subtile distinctions, the thin and shadowy differences of words which he creates or seizes. Yet he himself seems to walk unbewildered in his own labyrinth; he walks apparently as calmly and firmly as if he were in open day; leaves nothing unquestioned, unaccounted for; defines the undefinable, distinguishes the undistinguishable; and lays down his conclusions as if they were mathematical truths.

Aquinas's world of Angels and Demons comprehended the whole mystic Hierarchy of the Areopagite. Matter is not their substance; they are immaterial. They are not self-subsistent; being is not their essence.¹ They are, on one side, finite; on the other, infinite: upwards, finite; for they are limited by the stern line which divides them from the Godhead: infinite, downwards; for they seek no inferior subject. But as that which diversifies, multiplies, and individualizes, is matter, and divisibility is the essential property of matter, all the Angels, thence, logically, would be but one Angel, as there is but one pure spirituality. In this point, and about the whole subject of Angels, Thomas, instead

¹ *Esse Angeli non est essentia sed accidens.* — *Summa*, i. quest. xii. Art. 4. They owe their being to a free act of the divine will. Compare Haureau, p. 155.

of being embarrassed, seemed to delight and revel ; his luxury of distinction and definition, if it be not a contradiction, his imaginative logic, is inexhaustible. He is absolutely wanton in the questions which he starts, and answers with all the grave satisfaction as on solemn questions of life and death.¹

The third world is that of matter and of man. The world was created by God according to forms (or ideas) existent, not without but within the Deity ; for God must have known what he would create. These forms, these ideas, these types of existing things, are part of God's infinite knowledge ; they are the essence of God ; they are God. Man is inseparable from matter ; matter cannot exist without form.² The soul, the intelligence of man, constitutes the third world. It shares, in some degree, the immateriality of the two higher orders. It is self-subsistent ; but it needs the material body, as its organ, its instrument. It is not, however, preëxistent ; Origen was a name of ill repute in the Church ; his doctrine therefore, by some subtile logical effort, must be rejected. Each separate soul is not created ere it is infused into the human body ; this creation is simultaneous ; nothing uncreate is presupposed.³ But if not self-subsistent, not possibly preëxistent, before their union with the body, how, according

¹ E. g. *Utrum in Angelis sit cognitio matutina et vespertina*. "Whether angels reason by logic" had been discussed before.

² God cannot create matter without form ; this is a necessary limit of his omnipotence. It would be a contradiction. — *Summa*.

³ *Cum anima sine corpore existens non habeat suæ naturæ perfectionem, nec Deus ab imperfectis suum opus inchoaret, simpliciter fatendum est animas simul cum corporibus creari et infundi*. — *Summa*, i. quæst. xviii. 3. *Creatio est productio alicujus rei secundum suam totam substantiam nullo presupposito, quod sit vel increatum, vel ab aliquo creatum*. — *Quæst. xv. 3.*

to the orthodox doctrine, can souls be self-subsistent after the dissolution of the union? St. Thomas takes refuge in the Angelic world. This, too, was created; and the souls, retaining the individuality, which they had acquired in their conjunction with matter, withdraw as it were into this separate immaterial and unmingling world.

It is obvious that our space only permits us to touch, and, we fear, with inevitable obscurity, some of the characteristic views of St. Thomas. St. Thomas, like his predecessor, Albert, on the great question of universals, is Eclectic; neither absolutely Realist, Conceptualist, nor Nominalist. Universals are real only in God, and but seemingly, in potentiality rather than actuality: they are subjective in the intelligence of man; they result objectively in things. St. Thomas rejects the Democritean effluxes of outward things, by which the atomistic philosophy accounted for our perceptions: he admits images of things reflected and received by the senses as by a mirror, and so brought under the cognizance of the intelligence. The intelligence has, as it were, only the power, a dormant faculty of knowledge, till the object is presented, through the image. But the conception by the senses is confused, indeterminate; till abstracted, analyzed, at once universalized and individualized by the intelligence.¹

¹ *Cognitio indistincta.* Ainsi la sensation est antérieure à l'intellection, c'est convenu; mais toute sensation est indéterminée, universellement confuse, avant d'être achevée, avant d'être l'acte qui la termine, c'est-à-dire l'idée individuelle de la chose sentie, le fantôme; de même l'intellection n'est devenue cette idée claire, positive, absolument distincte de tout autre, qui répond au mot humanité qu'après un travail de l'esprit qui distrait tout le propre de l'humanité de la notion antérieure et confuse de l'animalité. On ne s'attendait peut-être pas à ce travail, chez un docteur du treizième siècle, cette savante critique de la faculté de connaître. — Haureau, p

Yet Thomas ruled not in uncontested supremacy even in his intellectual realm: he was en-*Franciscans*. countered by an antagonist as severely intellectual as himself. No doubt the jealousy of the rival orders, the Dominican and the Franciscan, had much to do with the war of the Scotists and the Thomists, which divided the very narrow world which understood, or thought they understood, the points in dispute, and the wider world who took either side, on account of the habit, Franciscan or Dominican, of the champion. It is singular to trace, even in their Scholasticism, the ruling character, so oppugnant to each other, of the two Orders. In Albert the Great, and in St. Thomas, there is something staid, robust, muscular, the calmness of conscious strength; their reasoning is more sedate, if to such a subject the term may be applied, more practical. The intelligence of man is to be trained by severe discipline to the height of knowledge; and knowledge is its high ultimate reward. With the Franciscans there is still passion: in Bonaventura, the mild passion of Mysticism; in Duns Scotus, Bonaventura. if it may be so said, Logic itself is become a passion. Duns is, by nature, habit, training, use, a polemic. In Ockham it is a revolutionary passion in philosophy as in politics. The true opposite, indeed rival he may be called, of Thomas, was his contemporary, his friend Bonaventura. These two men were to have met at the

203. I have made this extract, not merely because it contains an important illustration of the philosophy of Aquinas, but because it is such a remarkable indication of the penetrative good sense, which, notwithstanding all his scholastic subtilty, appears, as far as my narrow acquaintance with his works, to set Aquinas above all Schoolmen. I have read the splendid quarto volume of M. Carle, 'Histoire de la Vie et des Ecrits de St. Thomas d'Aquin,' of which I much admire the — type.

Council of Lyons. One died on the road, the other just lived to receive his Cardinal's hat, with the full applause of that great Œcumenic Synod : a Pope, an Emperor, and a King, attended his magnificent funeral. In Bonaventura the philosopher *recedes* ; religious edification is his mission. A much smaller proportion of his voluminous works is pure Scholasticism : he is teaching by the Life of his Holy Founder, St. Francis, and by what may be called a new Gospel, a legendary Life of the Saviour, which seems to claim, with all its wild traditions, equal right to the belief with that of the Evangelists. Bonaventura himself seems to deliver it as his own unquestioning faith. Bonaventura, if not ignorant of, feared or disdained to know much of Aristotle or the Arabians : he philosophizes only because in his age he could not avoid philosophy. The philosophy of Bonaventura rests on the theological doctrine of Original Sin : the soul, exiled from God, must return to God. The most popular work of Bonaventura, with his mystic admirers, was the Itinerary of the Soul to God. The love of God, and the knowledge of God, proceed harmoniously together, through four degrees or kinds of light. The external light, by which we learn the mechanic arts : the inferior light, which shines through the senses, by these we comprehend individuals or things : the internal light, the reason, which by reflection raises the soul to intellectual things, to universals in conception : the superior light of grace, which reveals to us the sanctifying virtues, shows us universals, in their reality, in God.

Bonaventura rests not below this highest light.¹ Philosophy pretends that it may soar to the utmost

¹ From Haureau, p. 224.

heights, and behold the Invisible ; it presumes to aver that thought, by dwelling on God, may behold him in spirit and in truth. Against this doctrine Bonaventura protests with all his energy. Reason may reach the ultimate bounds of nature : would it trespass farther, it is dazzled, blinded by excess of light. Is faith in the intellect or in the affections ? it enlightens the intellect, it rules over the affections. Which has the greater certitude, knowledge or faith ? There must be a distinction. There is a knowledge which is confined to human things. There is a knowledge which is the actual vision of God. This ultimate knowledge, though of faith, is superior to faith ; it is its absolute perfection. There is a certainty of speculation, a certainty of adhesion. The certainty of adhesion is the certainty of faith ; for this men have died. What Geometer ever died to vindicate the certainty of geometry ?¹ All this lower knowledge ought to be disdainfully thrown aside for the knowledge of God. All sensible appearances, all intellectual operations, should be dismissed ; the whole weight of the affections be fixed and centred on the one absolute essence in God. The faithful Christian, if he might know the whole of physical science, would, in his loyal adhesion to his be-

¹ Est enim certitudo speculationis et est certitudo adhæſionis ; et prima quidem respicit Intellectum, secunda vero respicit ipsum affectum. . . . Sic major est certitudo in ipsa fide quod sit in habitu scientiæ, pro eo quod vera fides magis facit adhærere ipsum credentem veritati creditæ, quam aliqua scientia alicujus rei scitæ. Videmus enim veros fideles nec per argumenta, nec per tormenta, nec per blandimenta, inclinari posse ut veritatem quam credunt, saltem ore tenus, negent. Stultus etiam esset *geometra* qui pro quacunque certâ conclusione geometriæ, auderet subire mortem. — In Sentent. xxiii. quæst. 11 a 14, quoted by Haureau, p. 226. Strange prediction of Galileo ! Verus fidelis etiam si sciret totam physicam, mallet totam illam scientiam perdere, quam unum solum articulum perdere vel negare, adeo adhærens veritati creditæ. — Ibid.

lief, lose all that science rather than abandon or deny one article of the faith. The raptures of Bonaventura, like the raptures of all Mystics, tremble on the borders of Pantheism: he would still keep up the distinction between the soul and God; but the soul must aspire to absolute unity with God, in whom all ideas are in reality one, though many according to human thought and speech. But the soul, by contemplation, by beatific vision, is, as it were, to be lost and merged in that Unity.¹

Where the famous Duns Scotus was born, in Scotland, in Ireland, in Northumberland; why called the Scot, what was his parentage; all is utter darkness, thick and impenetrable as his own writings, from whence some derived his Greek name, Scotus. He appeared a humble Franciscan at Oxford; the subtile Doctor gathered around him 30,000 pupils. At Paris he was not heard by less eager or countless crowds. From Paris he went to Cologne, and there died. The vast writings of Duns Scotus, which as lectures thousands thronged to hear, spread out as the dreary sandy wilderness of philosophy; if its border be now occasionally entered by some curious traveller, he may return with all the satisfaction, but hardly the reward, of a discoverer. The toil, if the story of his early death be true, the rapidity, of this man's mental productiveness, is perhaps the most wonderful fact in

¹ Et quoniam cognoscens est unum, et cognita sunt multa, ideo omnes ideæ in Deo sunt unum, secundum rem, sed tamen plures secundum rationem intelligendi sive dicendi. — In Intel. i. xxv. 1-3, quoted by Ritter, p. 496. Tu autem, o amice, circa mysticas visiones corroborato itinere et sensus desere et intellectuales operationes et sensibilia et invisibilia, et omne non ens et ens, et ad unitatem, ut possibile est, inscius restituere ipsum, qui est super omnem essentiam et scientiam. Itin. Ment. ad Deum, 2, 5, 7. — Ibid. p. 498.

the intellectual history of our race. He is said to have died at the age of thirty-four, a period at which most minds are hardly at their fullest strength, having written thirteen closely-printed folio volumes, without an image, perhaps without a superfluous word, except the eternal logical formularies and amplifications.¹ These volumes do not contain his Sermons and Commentaries, which were of endless extent. The mind of Duns might seem a wonderful reasoning machine; whatever was thrown into it came out in syllogisms: of the coarsest texture, yet in perfect flawless pattern. Logic was the idol of Duns; and this Logic-worship is the key to his whole philosophy. Logic was asserted by him not to be an art, but a science; ratiocination was not an instrument, a means for discovering truth: it was an ultimate end; its conclusions were truth. Even his language was Logic-worship. The older Schoolmen preserved something of the sound, the flow, the grammatical construction, we must not say of Cicero or Livy, but of the earlier Fathers, especially of St. Augustine. The Latinity of Duns is a barbarous jargon.² His subtile distinctions constantly demanded new words: he made them without scruple. It would require the most patient study, as well as a new Dictionary, to comprehend his terms. Logic being a science,

¹ Haureau adopts this account of the age of Duns without hesitation; it has been controverted, however, rather from the incredibility of the fact than from reasons drawn from the very few known circumstances or dates of his life. See Schroeckh. xxiv. 437. Trithemius, a very inaccurate writer, makes him a hearer of Alexander Hales in 1245; if so, at his death in 1308 he must have been above sixty. But no doubt the authority, whoever he was, of Trithemius wrote Scholar (follower), not Hearer.

² Scotus has neither the philosophic dignity nor the calm wisdom of Thomas; he is rude, polemic. He does not want theologic hatred. Saraceni — vilissimi porci — asini Manichei. Ille maledictus Averrhoes. — Ritter, p. 360.

not an art, the objects about which it is conversant are not representatives of things, but real things; the conceptions of human thought, things, according to the Thomist theory, of second intention, are here as things of first intention, actual as subsistent. Duns, indeed, condescended to draw a distinction between pure and applied Logic; the vulgar applied Logic might be only an instrument; the universals, the entities of pure logic, asserted their undeniable reality. Duns Scotus is an Aristotelian beyond Aristotle, a Platonist beyond Plato; at the same time the most sternly orthodox of Theologians.¹ On the eternity of matter he transcends his master: he accepts the hardy saying of Avicembron,² of the universality of matter. He carries matter not only higher than the intermediate world of Devils and Angels, but up into the very Sanctuary, into the Godhead itself. And how is this? by dematerializing matter, by stripping it of everything which, to the ordinary apprehension, and not less to philosophic thought, has distinguished matter; by spiritualizing it to the purest spirituality. Matter only became

¹ Die Richtung, welche er seiner Wissenschaft gegeben hat, ist durchaus kirchlich. — Ritter, p. 326.

² Je reviens, dit-il, à la thèse d'Avicembron (ego autem ad positionem Avicembronis redeo), et je soutiens d'abord que toute substance créée, corporelle ou spirituelle, participe de la matière. Je prouve ensuite que cette matière est une en tous — quod sit unica materia. — Haureau, p. 328. Selbst die Materie, obwohl sie die niedrigste von allem Seienden ist, muss doch also ein Seiendes gedacht werden und hat ihre Idee in Gott. — Ritter, p. 432. The modern Baconian philosophy may appear in one sense to have reached the same point as the metaphysical philosophy of Duns Scotus, to have subtilized matter into immateriality, to have reached the point where the distinction between the spiritual and material seems to be lost, and almost mocks definition. It is arrived at centres of force, powers impalpable, imponderable, infinite. But it is one thing to refine away all the qualities of matter by experiment, and to do it by stripping words of their conventional meaning. Mr. Faraday's discoveries and his fame will not meet the fate of Duns Scotus.

material by being conjoined with form. Before that it subsisted potentially only, abstract, unembodied, immaterial; an entity conceivable alone, but as being conceivable, therefore real. For this end the Subtile Doctor created, high above all vulgar common matter, a primary primal, a secondary primal, a tertiary primal matter; and yet this matter was One. The universal Primary primal matter is in all things; but as the secondary primal matter has received the double form of the corruptible and incorruptible, it is shared between these two. The tertiary primal matter distributes itself among the infinite species which range under these genera.¹ It is strange to find Scholasticism, in both its opposite paths, gliding into Pantheism. An universal infinite Matter, matter refined to pure Spiritualism, comprehending the finite, sounds like the most extreme Spinosism. But Scotus, bewildered by his own skilful word-juggling, perceives not this, and repudiates the consequence with indignation. God is still with him the high, remote Monad, above all things, though throughout all things.² In him, and not without him, according to what is asserted to be Platonic doctrine, are the forms and ideas of things. With equal zeal, and with equal ingenuity with the Thomists, he attempts to maintain the free-will of God, whom he seems to have bound in the chain of inexorable necessity.³ He saves it by a distinction which even his

¹ Dicitur materia secundo prima quæ est subjectum generationis et corruptionis, quam mutant et transmutant agentia creata, seu angeli seu agentia corruptibilia: quæ ut dixi, addit ad materiam primo primam, quia esse subjectum generationis non potest sine aliquâ formâ substantiali aut sine quantitate, quæ sunt extra rationem materiæ primo primæ. — Haureau.

² Haureau, p. 359.

³ L'origine de toutes les erreurs propagées au sujet de la Création vient, dit-il, de ce que les philosophes ont témérairement assimilé la volonté di-

subtilty can hardly define. Yet, behind and without this nebulous circle, Duns Scotus, as a metaphysical and an ethical writer, is remarkable for his bold speculative views on the nature of our intelligence, on its communication with the outward world, by the senses, by its own innate powers, as well as by the influence of the superior Intelligence. He thinks with perfect freedom; and if he spins his spider-webs, it is impossible not to be struck at once by their strength and coherence. Translate him, as some have attempted to translate him, into intelligible language, he is always suggestive, sometimes conclusive.

The war of Scotists and Thomists long divided the Schools, not the less fierce from the utter darkness in which it was enveloped. It is not easy to define in what consisted their implacable, unforgiven points of difference. If each combatant had been compelled rigidly to define every word or term which he employed, concord might not perhaps have been impossible; but words were their warfare, and the war of words their business, their occupation, their glory. The Conceptualism or Eclecticism of St. Thomas (he cannot be called a Nominalist) admitted so much

vine à la volonté humaine; aussi combat-il de toutes ses forces cette assimilation, sans réussir, toutefois, à démêler d'une manière satisfaisante ce que c'est la détermination temporelle d'une acte éternelle. — Haureau, p. 363. The reader who may be curious to learn how Duns Scotus solves other important physical and metaphysical questions, the principle of motion, the personality and immortality of the soul, will do well to read the chapters of M. Haureau, compared, if he will, with the heavier synopsis of Brucker, the neater of Tenneman, the more full and elaborate examination of Ritter. Ritter dwells more on the theological and ethical part of the system of Duns Scotus, whom he ranks not only as the most acute and subtlest, but, as should seem, the highest of the Schoolmen. The pages in which he traces the theory of Scotus respecting the means by which our knowledge is acquired are most able, and full of interest for the metaphysical reader.

Realism, under other forms of speech ; the Realism of Duns Scotus was so absolutely a Realism of words, reality was with him something so thin and unsubstantial ; the Augustinianism of St. Thomas was so guarded and tempered by his high ethical tone, by his assertion of the loftiest Christian morality ; the Pelagianism charged against Scotus is so purely metaphysical, so balanced by his constant, for him vehement, vindication of Divine grace,¹ only with notions peculiar to his philosophy, of its mode of operation, and with almost untraceable distinctions as to its mode of influence, that nothing less than the inveterate pugnacity of Scholastic Teaching, and the rivalry of the two Orders, could have perpetuated the strife.² That strife was no doubt heightened and embittered by their real differences, which touched the most sensitive part of the Mediæval Creed, the worship of the Virgin. This was coldly and irreverently limited by the refusal of the Dominican to acknowledge her Immaculate Conception and birth ; wrought to a height above all former height by the passionate maintenance of that tenet in every Franciscan cloister, by every Franciscan Theologian.

But, after all, the mortal enemy of the Franciscan

¹ Ritter, p. 359. He is not only orthodox on this point; he is hierarchical to the utmost. He adopts the phrase ascribed to St. Augustine, that he would not believe the Gospel but on the witness of the Church. The power of the keys he extends not only to temporal but to eternal punishments — doch mit dem Zusatze, dass hierbei, so wie in andern Dingen der Priester nur als Werkzeug Gottes handle, welcher selbst eines bösen Engels sich bedienen könnte um einer gültigen Taufe zu vollziehen. — Scotus draws a distinction (he saves everything by a distinction which his subtilty never fails to furnish) between the absolute and secondary will of God.

² Ritter thinks their philosophy vitally oppugnant (p. 364), but it is in reconciling their philosophy with the same orthodox theology that they again approximate. One defines away necessity till it ceases to be necessity, the other fetters free-will till it ceases to be free.

scholasticism was in the Franciscan camp. The religious mysticism of Bonaventura, the high orthodox subtilism of Duns Scotus, were encountered by a more dangerous antagonist. The schism of Francis-
William of Ockham.ciscanism was propagated into its philosophy; the Fraticelli, the Spiritnalists, must have their champion in the Schools, and that champion in ability the equal of those without and those within their Order, of Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus. As deep in the very depths of metaphysics, as powerful a wielder of the great arm of the war, Logic; more fearless and peremptory as less under the awe of the Church in his conclusions — William of Ockham had already shaken the pillars of the hierarchical polity by his audacious assertion of the more than coequal rights of the temporal Sovereign; by his stern, rigid nominalism, he struck with scholastic arguments, in the hardest scholastic method, at the foundations of the Scholastic Philosophy. William was of undistinguished birth, from the village of Ockham, in Surrey; he entered into the Franciscan order, and was sent to study theology under Duns Scotus at Paris. The quarrel of Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair was at its height. How deeply the haughty and rapacious Pope had injured the Franciscan order, especially the English Franciscans, has been told.¹ How far William of Ockham was then possessed by the resentment of his Order, how far he had inclined to the extreme Franciscanism, and condemned his own Order, as well as the proud Prelates of the Church, for their avarice of wealth, does not clearly appear. He took up boldly, unreservedly, to the utmost height, the rights of temporal Sovereigns.

¹ See vol. vi. p. 290.

In his Disputation on the ecclesiastical power¹ he refused to acknowledge in the Pope any authority whatever as to secular affairs. Jesus Christ himself, as far as he was man, as far as he was a sojourner in this mortal world, had received from his heavenly Father no commission to censure Kings; the partisans of the Papal temporal omnipotence were to be driven as heretics from the Church. In the strife of his Order with John XXII., William of Ockham is, with Michael of Cesena and Bonagratia, the fearless assertor of absolute poverty.² These men confronted the Pope in his power, in his pride, in his wealth. The Defence of Poverty by William of Ockham was the most dauntless, the most severely reasoned, the most sternly consequent, of the addresses poured forth to astonished A.D. 1322.

Christendom by these daring Revolutionists. Pope John commanded the Bishops of Ferrara and Bologna to examine and condemn this abominable book. Five years after, William of Ockham, Michael de Cesena and Bonagratia, were arraigned at Avignon, and in close custody, for their audacious opinions. William of Ockham might already, if he had any fear, shudder at the stake and the fire in which had perished so many of his brethren. They fled, took ship at Aigues Mortes, found their way to the Court of Louis of Bavaria. They were condemned by the Pope, cast off by their own Order. The Order at the Synod of Perpignan renounced the brotherhood of these men, who denounced their wealth as well as that of the Pope, and would admit nothing less than absolute, more than apostolic poverty. Their sentence was that of heretics and

¹ *Disputatio super potestate ecclesiasticâ prælatis atque principibus terrarum commissâ.* — In Goldastus de Monarchia. Compare Haureau, p. 419.

² *Apud Brown, Fasciculus.*

schismatics, deprivation of all privileges, perpetual imprisonment. But William of Ockham, in the Court of Louis, at Munich, laughed to scorn and defied their idle terrors. He became the champion of the Imperial rights, of the Franciscan Antipope, Peter of Corbara. He did not live to put to shame by his firmer, and more resolute resistance to the Pope, the timid, vacillating, yielding Louis of Bavaria.

William of Ockham was in philosophy as intrepid and as revolutionary as in his political writings. He is a consummate schoolman in his mastery, as in his use of logic; a man who wears the armour of his age, engages in the spirit of his age, in the controversies of his age; but his philosophy is that of centuries later.¹ The scholastic theologian can discuss with subtilty equal to the subtilest, whether Angelic natures can be circumscribed in a certain place; the Immaculate birth and conception of the Virgin, on which he is faithfully Franciscan; Transubstantiation, on which he enters into the most refined distinctions, yet departs not from the dominant doctrine. As a philosopher Ockham reverently secludes the Godhead² from his investigation. Logic, which deals with finite things, must not presume

¹ Quodlibeta. Compare Schroeckh. xxxiv. 196-7.

² Quodlibet ii. quæst. ii. Haureau, 422. — In another part M. Haureau sums up Ockham's awful reserve on the notion of God so boldly formed by the older Schoolmen: "C'est précisément cette notion rationnelle de la substance divine que Guillaume d'Ockham critique et réduit à un concept arbitrairement composé; composé de concepts qui expriment bien, sans doute, quelque chose de Dieu (*aliquid Dei*,) mais ne désignent pas Dieu lui-même, la substance, l'essence de Dieu, *quod est Deus* . . . cette notion abstraite de Dieu, cette notion qui, on le prouve bien, ne représente pas son objet, est la seule que possède la raison humaine, la seule qui lui permet de soupçonner, de diviner, de poser l'entité mystérieuse de la suprême cause. Faut-il désirer une connaissance plus parfaite de cette cause? Sans aucun doute; mais en attendant, il faut s'en tenir à ce qu'il sait." — p. 454. See also the preceding pages.

to discuss the Infinite First Cause. He at once, and remorselessly, destroys all the idols of the former schoolmen. Realism must surrender all her multifarious essences, her abstract virtues, her species, her ideas. Universals are but modes of thought; even the phantasms of Aquinas must disappear. Ideas are no longer things; they are the acts of the thinking being. Between the subject which knows and the object known there is nothing intermediate. The mind is one, with two modes or faculties, — sensibility and intelligence. Sensation is not sufficient to impart knowledge; there must be also an act of intelligence: the former is purely intuitive, the latter is, as it were, judicial. The difference between the sensitive and intelligent is thus partly by experience, partly by reason. By experience, the child sees through sensation, not through intelligence; by reason, because the soul, when separate, sees intellectually, but not through the senses. The sensitive vision is the potential cause of the intellectual vision, but not the potential cause of the intellectual assent. After intuition comes abstraction, sensation, or the intuitive notion, being always singular; abstraction may, as it were, insulate that which is singular, disengaging it from all its surrounding circumstances; it may introduce plurality, combine, compare, multiply. Thus ideas are simple perceptions, or conceptions, and so not only fall away the Democritean notions of actual images which have a local existence, and pass from the object to the sense, but likewise even the impressions, as of a seal, which is the doctrine of Scotus, and the real phantasms of St. Thomas.¹ Of course he denies

¹ Dès que les idées ne sont plus considérées comme des choses mais comme des actes du sujet pensant, que de chimères s'évanouissent! — p. 439.

not the images or similitude of things in the organ of sight, but they are as the reflections in a mirror: they do not precede and determine, though they accompany the sensation. The universal is but a conception of the mind; and as these conceptions are formed or perpetuated by these processes, each is the repetition, the reflection of the other, in intelligence, speech, writing. Universals are words, whether conceived, spoken, or written words, which by common consent express under one term many singular things.¹ In this respect, then, is William of Ockham a Nominalist in the strongest sense.

Thus may William of Ockham seem with fine and prophetic discrimination to have assigned their proper, indispensable, yet limited power and office to the senses; to have vindicated to the understanding its higher, separate, independent function; to have anticipated the famous axiom of Leibnitz, that there is nothing in the intellect but from the senses, except the intellect itself; to have anticipated Hobbes; foreshadowed Locke, not as Locke is vulgarly judged, according to his later French disciples, but in himself;² to have taken his stand on the same ground with Kant. What Abélard was to the ancestors of the Schoolmen was Ockham to the Schoolmen themselves. The Schoolmen could not but eventuate in William of Ockham; the united stream could not but

¹ "Est . . . universale, vox vel scriptum, aut quodcunque aliud signum ex meditatione vel voluntario usu, significans plura singularia universè." Quoted in Haureau, p. 469.

² I must be allowed to refer to the excellent article on Locke in Mr. Hallam's Literary History; and to a very elaborate and able review of this groundwork of Locke's philosophy in the 'Edinburgh Review,' lately republished among the Essays by Mr. Rogers.

endeavor to work itself clear; the incessant activity of thought could hardly fail to call forth a thinker like Ockham.

Such was the character of the Scholastic Philosophy, such the chief of the scholastic philosophers, such the final assertion and vindication of the sole dominion of Latin Christianity over the mind of man. Between the close of this age, but before the birth of modern philosophy, was to come the Platonizing, half Paganizing, school of Marsilius Ficinus: the age to end in direct rebellion, in the Italian philosophers, against Christianity itself. But it was an extraordinary fact, that in such an age, when Latin Christianity might seem at the height of its mediæval splendor and power, the age of chivalry, of Cathedral and Monastic architecture, of poetry in its romantic and religious forms, so many powerful intellects should be so incessantly busy with the metaphysics of religion; religion, not as taught by authority, but religion under philosophic guidance, with the aid, they might presume to say with the servile, the compulsory aid, of the Pagan Aristotle and the Mohammedan Arabians, but still with Aristotle and the Arabians admitted to the honor of a hearing: not regarded as odious, impious, and godless, but listened to with respect, discussed with freedom, refuted with confessed difficulty. With all its seeming outward submission to authority, Scholasticism at last was a tacit universal insurrection against authority; it was the swelling of the ocean before the storm; it began to assign bounds to that which had been the universal all-embracing domain of Theology. It was a sign of the reawakening life of the human mind that Theologians dared, that they thought it

their privilege, that it became a duty to philosophize. There was vast waste of intellectual labor ; but still it was intellectual labor. Perhaps at no time in the history of man have so many minds, and those minds of great vigor and acuteness, been employed on subjects almost purely speculative. Truth was the object of research ; truth, it is true, fenced about by the strong walls of authority and tradition, but still the ultimate remote object. Though it was but a trammelled reluctant liberty, liberty which locked again its own broken fetters, still it could not but keep alive and perpetuate the desire of more perfect, more absolute emancipation. Philosophy once heard could not be put to silence.

One man alone, Roger Bacon, even in his own day, had stood aloof from this all-absorbing Theology, this metaphysical or ontological philosophy, which, with all the rest, was the dominant aim of all profound and rigidly syllogistic investigation ; the primary, if not exclusive subject-matter of all the vast volumes, in which the same questions, argued in the same forms, revolved in eternal round. Roger Bacon alone sought other knowledge, and by other processes of thought and reasoning. Not that physical, or mathematical, or even experimental sciences were absolutely disdained or proscribed among the highest Theologians : they were pursued by Albert the Great with the ardor of his all grasping intellect. But with Roger Bacon they were the predominant master studies. Even he, on his side, could not withdraw entirely from that which had been so long, and was to be still, so exclusively the province of all human thought, which must occupy it more or less, Theology ; but the others were manifestly the en-

grossing pursuit, the passion, as far as such men are capable of passion, of his mind. Yet Latin Christianity can hardly lay claim to the glory, whatever that might be, of Roger Bacon. The Church, which could boast her Albert, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, repudiated Roger Bacon with jealous suspicion. That which is his fame in later days, heaped on him, in his own, shame and persecution. For at least ten years he was in prison; it is not quite clear that he ever emerged from that prison. Yet, though he has no proper place, though he is no way the son or the scholar of Latin Christianity, still, in justice to the rulers in Latin Christendom, as well as characterizing their rule (the exceptional man often throws the strongest light on the times), must be instituted a more close, yet of necessity rapid investigation into the extent and causes of the persecution of Roger Bacon.

At Oxford, his first place of study, Roger Bacon was remarked for his zeal in mathematical and scientific studies.¹ But Paris was at that ^{Born about 1214.} time to Transalpine Christendom what Athens was to later Rome. Without having attended lectures at Paris, no one could aspire to learned, or philosophical, or theological eminence. At Paris his great talent and acquirements obtained him the name of the "Wonderful Doctor." It was at Paris no doubt that he matured those studies, which he afterwards developed in his "Greater Work."² He could not but excite wonder; doubtless he did excite more than wonder, for he dared

¹ It is disputed whether at Merton College or Brazenose Hall. As Bacon was not a member of Merton College, according to the fashion of the day he may possibly at different times have lodged both in one and in the other. The halls were merely places of residence for Scholars.

² The *Opus Majus*.

to throw off entirely the bondage of the Aristotelian logic. When he judged Aristotle, it should seem, only by those parts of his works, matured in the Dialectics of the Schools, he would have been the Omar of Aristotle; he would willingly have burned all his books, as wasting time, as causes of error, and a multiplication of ignorance.¹ But Aristotle, as a philosopher, especially as commented by Avicenna, after Aristotle the prince of philosophers, is the object of his profound reverence. The studies of Roger Bacon embraced every branch of physical science, Astronomy, Optics, Mechanics, Chemistry. He seems even to have had some glimpses of that which has first grown into a science in our own day. He was an industrious student of all languages, Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, the modern tongues. He had a dim notion of their kindred and filiation. He had a vision of a Universal Grammar, by which all languages were to be learned in an incredibly short space of time.² In Paris his fellow-student was the famous Robert Grosstête: the inti-

¹ "Si haberem potestatem super libros Aristotelis, ego facerem omnes cremari, quia non est nisi temporis amissio studere in illis, et causa erroris, et multiplicati erroris." See on the translators of Aristotle, *Opus Majus*, quoted by Jebb in *Præfat.* i. c. viii.

² As his astronomy sometimes tampered with astrology, his chemistry degenerated into alchemy, so his knowledge of languages was not without what, in modern times, might be branded as charlatanism. He professed that, according to his Universal Grammar, he could impart to an apt and diligent scholar a knowledge of Hebrew in three days, of Greek in as many more. "Certum est mihi quod intra tres dies quemcunque diligentem et confidentem docerem Hebræum et simul legere et intelligere quicquid sancti dicunt et sapientes antiqui in expositione sacri textûs, et quicquid pertinet ad illius textûs correctionem, et expositionem, si vellet se exercere secundum doctrinam doctam: et per tres dies sciret de Græco iterum, ut non solum sciret legere et intelligere quicquid pertinet ad theologiam, sed ad philosophiam et ad linguam Latinam." — *Epist. de Laud. S. Script. ad P. Clement IV.* Here too he is breaking up the way to Biblical criticism.

mate friendship of such a man could not but commend him to the favor of some of the loftier Churchmen. He returned to Oxford, and in an evil hour took the fatal step (it is said by the advice of Grostête, who was infatuated with the yet ardent zeal of the Franciscans) of becoming a Franciscan Friar. Thus he became not merely subject to the general discipline of the Church, but to the narrower, more rigid, more suspicious rule of the Order.¹ It was difficult for a man of great powers to escape being a Dominican or Franciscan. The Dominicans were severe and jealously orthodox. The Inquisition was intrusted to them ; but they had a powerful and generous corporate spirit, and great pride in men of their own Order who showed transcendent abilities. The Franciscan Generals were, with the exception perhaps of John of Parma, and of St. Bonaventura, men of mean talent, of contracted and jealous minds, with all the timidity of ignorance.² The persecutor of Roger Bacon was Jerome of Ascoli, the General of his own Order ; first when as Cardinal he was aspiring towards the steps of the Papal throne ; afterwards when he ascended that throne as Nicolas IV.³ Nor indeed were wanting at that time causes which might seem to justify this ungenerous timidity in the Franciscans. They were watched with the jealousy of hatred by the Dominicans. Masters of the Inquisition, the Dominicans would triumph in the de-

¹ According to some he became a Franciscan at Paris.

² " Les Franciscains, toujours gouvernés, si l'on excepte Saint Bonaventura, par des généraux d'un menu talent et d'un médiocre savoir, ne se sentaient qu'humiliés de la présence et de la gloire des hommes de mérite, qui s'étaient égarés parmi eux." — M. V. de Clerc, *Hist. Lit. de la France*, xx. p. 230.

³ Jerome d'Ascoli was at Paris, the probable date of Bacon's persecution in 1278. I cannot but doubt the date usually assigned to his birth.

tection of Franciscan heretics. There had been already the first rending of their body by the fatal schism, under John of Parma, hardly allayed by the gentle and commanding rule of Bonaventura. The fierce democratic Ghibellinism was even now fermenting among them, hereafter to break out in the Anti-Papal writings of William of Ockham. Roger Bacon himself might seem disposed to tamper with perilous politics. On his return to Oxford, he preached, it is said, before King Henry III., and denounced, in no measured terms, the employment of French and Gascon Nobles and Prelates in the great offices of State; the prodigality of the King towards these foreign favorites; his blind confidence in the Bishop of Winchester; his placing foreign Poitevins in possession of the chief forts and strongholds in the realm. Even in his own Order, Roger Bacon is said to have shown the natural contempt of a man of his high acquirements for the ignorance and superstition of his brethren; to have let fall alarming words about Reform in the Franciscan Convents. Yet was he not without powerful friends; Grosstête, of Lincoln, and, after Grosstête's death, men at least of wealth and liberality. He is reported to have received at Oxford no less a sum than 2,000 Paris livres for books and instruments. Even the Church as yet seemed more disposed to admire and to honor, than to look with cold suspicion on the wonderful man. Pope A.D. 1238. Clement IV. accepted the dedication of the Work which contained all the great principles of his philosophy; all on which his awe-struck brethren looked as fearful magic. He received the work itself with some instruments invented by Bacon to illustrate his experiments. These Bacon, notwithstanding the direct

prohibition of the Rulers of his Order, who threatened him with the forfeiture of his book, and the penalty of confinement on bread and water, if he ^{Clement IV. Pope. 1265-1268.} dared to communicate with any one what might be his unlawful discoveries,¹ despatched through John of Paris to Rome. Philosophy was thus as it were entering its appeal to the Pope. Clement IV. was a Frenchman; no doubt knew the fame of Bacon at Paris. He had written a letter to Bacon entreating the communication of his famous wonders. Bacon had not dared to answer this letter till Clement was on the Papal throne; and even the Pope himself dared not openly to receive this appeal of philosophy. He stipulated that the books and the instruments should be sent as secretly as possible.² For the ten years which followed the death of Clement IV., Bacon lived an object of wonder, terror, suspicion, and of petty ^{A.D. 1268-1278.} persecution by his envious or his superstitious brethren. He attempted to propitiate Honorius IV. by a treatise on "The Mitigation of the Inconveniences of Old Age."³ At the close of these ten years, came to Paris, as Legate from Pope Nicolas III., Jerome of Ascoli, General of the Franciscan Order. Jerome was a true Franciscan; and before him the Franciscans found ready audience in the arraignment of that fearful magician, their Brother. It is singular that among the specific charges was that of undertaking to predict

¹ "Sub præcepto et poenâ amissionis libri et jejunio in pane et aquâ pluribus diebus, prohibuerunt eum a communicando scriptum aliquod a se factum cum aliis quibuscunque." — Opus Majus, MS. Cott. fol. 3.

² "Hoc quanto secretius poteris, facies." — Wadding, Ann. 11, p. 294, cited in an extremely good article on Roger Bacon in Didot's new *Bibliothèque Universelle*, which has avoided or corrected many errors in the old *Biographies*.

³ Honorius IV. not Nicolas IV. See *Hist. Lit. de la France*, p. 232.

future events. Bacon's own words show that the charge, however puerile, was true: "But for the stupidity of those employed, he would have framed astronomical tables, which, by marking the times when the heavenly bodies were in the same positions and conjunctions, would have enabled him to vaticinate their influence on human affairs."¹ That which to us was the rare folly of a wise man, to his own age was the crime of a wicked one. The general accusation was far more wide and indefinite, and from its indefiniteness more terrible. It was a compact with the Devil, from whom alone he had obtained his wonderful knowledge, and wrought his wonderful works. In vain Bacon sent out his contemptuous and defiant treatise on the nullity of magic: "Because things are above your shallow understandings, you immediately declare them works of the Devil." In such words he arraigns not the vulgar alone: "Theologians and Canonists, in their ignorance, abhor these things, as works of magic, and unbecoming a Christian." And thus the philosopher spoke against his whole Order; and before a Cardinal Legate, a Master of that Order. Roger Bacon was consigned to a Monastic dungeon at least for ten years; and as it is not likely that Jerome of Ascoli, as Pope, would mitigate the rigor, no doubt conscientiously exercised, most probably for five years more, till the close

¹ Throughout Bacon's astrological section (read from p. 225), the heavenly bodies act entirely through their physical properties, cold, heat, moisture, drought. The comet causes war (he attributes the wars then raging in Europe to a comet) not as a mere arbitrary sign, nor as by magic influence (all this he rejects as anile superstition), but as by its intense heat inflaming the blood and passions of men. It is an exaggeration (unphilosophical enough) of the influences of the planetary bodies, and the powers of human observation to trace their effects, but very different from what is ordinarily conceived of judicial astrology.

of the Pontificate of Nicolas IV. If he emerged from the darkness of his prison, it was not more than a year before his death.

The value and extent of Roger Bacon's scientific discoveries, or prophecies of discoveries, how far his own, or derived from Arabian sources, belongs rather to the history of philosophy than of Latin Christianity. His astronomy no doubt had enabled him to detect the error in the Julian year: three centuries too soon he proposed to Clement IV. to correct the Calendar by his Papal authority: but I presume not to enter further into this or kindred subjects. In Optics his admirers assert that he had found out many remarkable laws, the principle of the Telescope, the Refraction of Light, the cause of the Rainbow. He framed burning-glasses of considerable magnitude. Mechanics were among his favorite and most successful studies. In his Chemistry he had reached, or nearly reached, the invention of gunpowder: it is more certain that he sought the philosopher's stone, or at least a transmuting elixir with unlimited powers. There are passages about mounting in the air without wings, and self-moving carriages, travelling at vast speed without horses, which sound like vaticinations of still more wonderful things. He had no doubt discovered the cause of the tides. It is for others, too, to decide how far in the general principles of his philosophy he had anticipated his greater namesake, or whether it was more than the sympathy of two kindred minds working on the same subjects, which led to some singular yet very possibly fortuitous coincidences of thought and expression.¹ This,

¹ See Mr. Forster's "Mohammedanism Unveiled," and Mr. Hallam's judicious remarks, *Lit. Hist.*

however, is certain, that although the second Bacon's great work, as addressed to Europe, might condescend to the Latin form, it was in its strong copious Teutonic English that it wrought its revolution, that it became the great fountain of English thought, of English sagacity, the prelude to and the rule of English scientific discovery.

Roger Bacon has rather thrown us back in our chronology to the age of the older Scholasticism ; but Scholasticism ruled supreme almost to the close of exclusive Latin Christianity ; it expired only by degrees ; its bonds were loosened, but not cast off : if its forms had given place to others more easy, natural, rhetorical, its modes of thought, its processes of ratiocination, its logic, and its definitions, still swathed the dead body of Christian Theology. Gerson was still in a great degree a schoolman, Wycliffe himself at Oxford was a schoolman. But Latin Christianity was not all scholastic theology, it was religion also ; it did not altogether forget to be piety, holiness, charity ; it was not content with its laborious endeavors to enlighten the mind ; it knew still that the heart was its proper domain. The religious feelings, the religious affections, the religious emotions, were not abandoned for the eternal syllogisms of the schools, the interminable process of twenty-fold assertion, twenty-fold objection, twenty-fold conclusion. It was not enough that the human intelligence should be taught that it was an efflux, a part of the Divine intelligence. Nor was the higher office of training the soul of man to communion with Christ by faith, purity, and love, altogether left to what may be called Scholastic Mysticism. In one remarkable book was gathered and centred all

•

that was elevating, passionate, profoundly pious, in all the older mystics. Gerson, Rysbroek, Tauler, all who addressed the heart in later times, were summed up, and brought into one circle of light and heat, in the single small volume, the “Imi-^{Imitation of Christ.}tation of Christ.” That this book supplied some imperious want in the Christianity of mankind, that it supplied it with a fulness and felicity, which left nothing, at this period of Christianity, to be desired, its boundless popularity is the one unanswerable testimony. No book has been so often reprinted, no book has been so often translated, or into so many languages, as the “Imitation of Christ.”¹ The mystery of its authorship as in other cases might have added to its fame and circulation; but that mystery was not wanted in regard to the “Imitation.” Who was the author — Italian, German, French, Fleming?² With each of these races it is taken up as a question of national vanity. Was it the work of Priest, Canon, Monk? This, too, in former times, was debated with the eagerness of rival Orders.³ The size of the book, the man-

¹ According to M. Michelet (whose rhapsody, as usual, contains much which is striking truth, much of his peculiar sentimentalism) there are sixty translations into French; in some respects he thinks the French translation, the “Consolation,” more pious and touching than the original.

² Italian, French, German idioms have been detected.

³ Several recent writers, especially M. Onésime Roy, “*Etudes sur les Mystères*,” have thought that they have proved it to be by the famous Gerson. If any judgment is to be formed from Gerson’s other writings, the internal evidence is conclusive against him. M. Michelet has some quotations from Thomas à Kempis, the author at least of a thick volume published under that name, which might seem equally to endanger his claim. But to me, though inferior, the other devotional works there ascribed to Thomas à Kempis, the *Soliloquium Animæ*, the *Hortulus Rosarum*, and *Vallis Lilium*, even the Sermons, if not quite so pure, are more than kindred, absolutely the same, in thought and language and style. See the *Opera T. à Kempis*: Antwerp, 1515.

ner, the style, the arrangement, as well as its profound sympathy with all the religious feelings, wants, and passions ; its vivid and natural expressions, to monastic Christianity what the Hebrew Psalms are to our common religion, to our common Christianity ; its contagious piety ; all conspired to its universal dissemination, its universal use. This one little volume contained in its few pages the whole essence of the St. Victors, of Bonaventura without his Franciscan peculiarities, and of the later mystic school. Yet it might be easily held in the hand, carried about where no other book was borne,—in the narrow cell or chamber, on the journey, into the solitude, among the crowd and throng of men, in the prison. Its manner, its short, quivering sentences, which went at once to the heart ; and laid hold of and clung tenaciously to the memory with the compression and completeness of proverbs ;¹ its axioms, each of which suggested endless thought ; its imagery, scriptural and simple, were alike original, unique. The style is ecclesiastical Latin, but the perfection of ecclesiastical Latin — brief, pregnant, picturesque ; expressing profound thoughts in the fewest words, and those words, if compared with the scholastics, of purer Latin sound or construction. The facility with which it passed into all other languages, those especially of Roman descent, bears witness to its perspicuity, vivacity, and energy. Its arrangement has something of the consecutive progress of an ancient initiation ; it has its commencement, its middle, and its close ; discriminating yet leading up the student in

¹ It is singular how it almost escapes or avoids that fatal vulgarity of most mystic works, metaphors taken from our lower senses, the taste, the touch.

constant ascent ; it is an epopee of the internal history of the human soul.

The "Imitation of Christ" both advanced and arrested the development of Teutonic Christianity ; it was prophetic of its approach, as showing what was demanded of the human soul, and as endeavoring, in its own way, to supply that imperative necessity ; yet by its deficiency, as a manual of universal religion, of eternal Christianity, it showed as clearly that the human mind, the human heart, could not rest in the Imitation. It acknowledged, it endeavored to fill up the void of *personal* religion. The Imitation is the soul of man working out its own salvation, with hardly any aid but the confessed necessity of divine grace. It may be because it is the work of an ecclesiastic, a priest or monk, but, with the exception of the exhortation to frequent communion, there is nothing whatever of sacerdotal intervention : all is the act, the obedience, the aspiration, the self-purification, self-exaltation of the soul. It is the Confessional in which the soul confesses to itself, absolves itself ; it is the Direction by whose sole guidance the soul directs itself. The Book absolutely and entirely supersedes and supplies the place of the spiritual teacher, the spiritual guide, the spiritual comforter : it is itself that teacher, guide, comforter. No manual of Teutonic devotion is more absolutely sufficient. According to its notion of Christian perfection, Christian perfection is attainable by its study, and by the performance of its precepts : the soul needs no other mediator, at least no earthly mediator, for its union with the Lord.

But "The Imitation of Christ," the last effort of Latin Christianity, is still monastic Christianity. It is

absolutely and entirely selfish in its aim, as in its acts. Its sole, single, exclusive object, is the purification, the elevation of the individual soul, of the man absolutely isolated from his kind, of the man dwelling alone in the solitude, in the hermitage of his own thoughts; with no fears or hopes, no sympathies of our common nature : he has absolutely withdrawn and secluded himself not only from the cares, the sins, the trials, but from the duties, the connections, the moral and religious fate of the world. Never was misnomer so glaring, if justly considered, as the title of the book, the "Imitation of Christ." That which distinguishes Christ, that which distinguishes Christ's Apostles, that which distinguishes Christ's religion — the Love of Man — is entirely and absolutely left out. Had this been the whole of Christianity, our Lord himself (with reverence be it said) had lived, like an Essene, working out or displaying his own sinless perfection by the Dead Sea : neither on the Mount, nor in the Temple, nor even on the Cross. The Apostles had dwelt entirely on the internal emotions of their own souls, each by himself, St. Peter still by the Lake of Gennesareth, St. Paul in the desert of Arabia, St. John in Patmos. Christianity had been without any exquisite precept for the purity, the happiness of social or domestic life ; without self-sacrifice for the good of others ; without the higher Christian patriotism, devotion on evangelic principles to the public weal ; without even the devotion of the missionary for the dissemination of Gospel truth ; without the humbler and gentler daily self-sacrifice for relatives, for the wife, the parent, the child. Christianity had never soared to be the civilizer of the world. "Let the world perish, so the single soul can escape on its soli-

tary plank from the general wreck," such had been its final axiom. The "Imitation of Christ" begins in self — terminates in self. The simple exemplary sentence, "He went about doing good," is wanting in the monastic gospel of this pious zealot. Of feeding the hungry, of clothing the naked, of visiting the prisoner, even of preaching, there is profound, total silence. The world is dead to the votary of the Imitation, and he is dead to the world, dead in a sense absolutely repudiated by the first vital principles of the Christian faith. Christianity, to be herself again, must not merely shake off indignantly the barbarism, the vices, but even the virtues of the Mediæval, of Monastic, of Latin Christianity.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LATIN POETRY. HISTORY.

WHAT did Latin Christianity add to the treasures of Latin poetry? Poetry, as in Greece, may have its distinct epochs in different forms, but it rarely, if ever, renews its youth.¹ Hardly more than half a century contains all that is of the highest order in Latin poetry — Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, the Elegiacs, Ovid. Even that noble declamatory verse, which in the best passages of Lucan, in Juvenal, and even in Claudian (this, with the philosophic and didactic poetry, Lucretius, Virgil, and the exquisite poetry of common sense and common life in Horace, the only indigenous poetry of Rome), dies feebly out in the triumph of Christianity over Heathenism, as celebrated by Prudentius in his book against Symmachus.

The three earlier forms of Christian Latin poetry were — I. Paraphrases of the Scripture, II. Christian Latin Poetry. Paraphrases. Legends of Saints, and III. Hymns, with a few controversial poems, like that of St. Prosper on Pelagianism. 1. In the Scriptural Poems the life and

¹ It has done so besides in Greece, in England alone, hardly in Italy, unless Alfieri be admitted to make a third Epoch, with Dante and Petrarch, with Ariosto and Tasso. Spain has had but one, that of Lope, Cervantes and Calderon; Germany but one, and that a late one, of Schiller and Goethe. The most striking parallel is in India, of the vast Epics, the Mahabharata and Ramayana, of the Drama of Calidasa, of the Lyric Gita Govinda.

energy of the biblical annalists or poets are beaten out to pleonastic and wearisome length ; the antithetic or parallelistic form of the Hebrew poetry is entirely lost ; the uncongenial Orientalism of thought and imagery will not submit to the hard involutions of the Latin : it dislocates the harmony of the verse, if verse still retains or strives after harmony, without giving its own rude strength or emphatic force. The Vulgate alone, by creating almost a new language, has naturalized the biblical thoughts and figures, which obstinately refuse to be bound in the fetters of the Latin Hexameter. The infallible poetic sentiment of mankind will still refuse the name of poetry to the prolix, though occasionally vigorous, versifications of Fortunatus, Juvenius, Sedulius, Arator, Avitus, and the rest. As to the old voyager in the vast interminable ocean, if he beheld on some dreary mass of rock a patch of brilliant green, a tuft of graceful trees, a cool rush of water, it became a paradise — a Tinian or a Juan Fernandez — and is described as one of the Elysian islands : so the curious reader, if, on traversing these endless poems, he discovers some lines more musical, some images more happily embodied in words, some finer or more tender thoughts expressed not without nature, he bursts out into rapture, and announces a deep mine of rich and forgotten poetry. The high-wrought expectations of the next visitants revenge their disappointment by exaggerating perhaps the dreariness and the barrenness.¹ In these

¹ Even M. Guizot, in his Lectures on Civilization, cites passages from these authors, with praise, as it seems to me, far beyond their due. They are pre-Miltonic, as he asserts, in some of their thoughts, in some of their imagery, that is, they are drawn from the same sources ; but what they want is, what Milton has given them, Poetry. So too M. Ampère in his valuable Lectures. The passage which I have quoted from Dracontius the

poems creative power there is and can be none : invention had been a kind of sacrilege. The Hebrew poetry, in the coldest and most artificial translation, preserves something of its life and sententious vigor, its bold figures and imagery : in the many-folded shroud of the Latin poetic paraphrase it is a mummy.

The Epic Poetry of Latin Christianity (I feel the abuse of the words) had done its work of paraphrase, or had nearly exhausted itself in a few centuries ; but if it sunk almost into silence from the fifth to the eighth, it rose again more ambitious, and seized the office of the historian, or that which had been the sole function of the humble orator under the later empire, that of the panegyrist. Hardly a great historic event took place, hardly a great man ascended a throne or achieved fame, but some monkish versifier aspired to immortalize him with an interminable length of harsh hexameter or of elegiac verse. Charlemagne indeed was mostly reserved for later romance, and happily had his historian Eginhard. But Louis the Pious was celebrated by Ermoldus Nigellus in a long poem in elegiac verse ; the siege of Paris by the Normans was sung in hexameters by Abbo ; the anonymous panegyrist endeavored to raise the Italian Berengar into a hero ; Hroswitha wrote of the deeds of the Emperor Otho ; Gunther, the Ligurian, those of Barbarossa ; Donizo, the Countess Matilda, from whom was inseparable the great name of Gregory VII. William the Apulian described the conquests of the Normans ; William of

Spaniard, in the *History of Christianity* (iii p. 470), still appears to me the most favorable example which has occurred in the course of my reading : and I have toilsomely read much of that age. To me they are inferior as Christian Latin Poetry to Sanazzaro or Vida and to some of the Jesuits, who are at least correct, animated, harmonious

Brittany, Philip Augustus ; and so in unexhausted succession to the Cardinal Poet of Cœlestine V. and Boniface VIII. But from all those historical poems, who has yet struck out for our admiration one passage of genuine poetry ? Perhaps their great merit is their want of poetry : they can lie under no suspicion of invention, hardly of poetic embellishment : they are simply verse chronicles, as veracious as the works of the contemporary prose historians of the cloister.

Nor were these inexhaustible and indefatigable writers in Latin verse content with the domain of ^{Later Latin} history, or the reward of the panegyrical ora- ^{poems.} tor. They seized and petrified, either for their amusement, or as a trial of skill, or for the solace and entertainment of their brother Monks, the old traditional German poetry, the fabulous histories, the initiatory romances, which, in their rude vernacular form and language, began to make themselves heard. What the Court or the Castle Hall listened to in the Lay or the Tale of the Wandering Minstrel, was heard in the Cloister in a Latin version. The Monks converted to their own use, perhaps supposed that they were saving from destruction, by transferring into imperishable Latin, the fleeting or expiring songs, which became the Niebelungen and the Heldenbuch. Such doubtless was the origin of the remarkable poem called Waltharius, or the expedition of Attila, founded on the Legends of Dietrich, Siegfried, and Etzel. But even in this very curious work it is remarkable that, although the innate poetry of the subject has given more than usual animation to the monkish versifier, yet the prosaic and historic element predominates. The cloister poet labors to make that history which is pure mythic romance :

the wild song is hardened into a chronicle.¹ The epic of John of Exeter, on the War of Troy (as no doubt his lost *Antiocheis*), is, in verse, the romance history prevalent under the authority of Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius, during the Middle Ages.² With other Poems of that class, it mingles in discordant confusion the wild adventures of the romance writers, the long desultory tales and luxuriant descriptions of the Trouvères, with the classical form of verse. Throughout it is the Monk vainly laboring to be the Bard; it is popular poetry cast in a form most remote from popularity, not only in a language, but in an artificial mould, which unfitted it for general acceptance. It was in truth the popular poetry of a small class, the more learned of the clergy and the Monk: the unlearned of that class must still have sought, and did seek, with the lay vulgar, their poetic enjoyment from the vernacular minstrel or Trouvère. Latinized, it was, as they no doubt thought, chastened and elevated for their more pious and fastidious ears. Latin verse condescended to this humbler office, little suspecting that these popular songs contained elements of the true poetic spirit, which would throw all the Latin epics of the Middle Ages into irretrievable obscurity. Nothing indeed could escape these all-appropriating indefatigable versifiers of the cloister. Almost all the vernacular poetry of the Middle Ages has its Latin counter-type, poems of chivalry,

¹ *De Expeditione Attilæ*, edited by Fischer, Leipsic, 1780: and later by Grimm and Schmeller, Gottingen, 1838. Compare Gervinus, *Geschichte der poetischen Nat. Lit. der Deutschen*, i. p. 99 *et seq.*

² Warton, in his *History of English Poetry*, gives some spirited verses from John of Exeter. The poem may be read (it is hard reading) subjoined to the edition of Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius. Amsterdam, 1702.

poems of adventure, of course Saint-Legends, even the long fables, which the Germans call beast-poetry, and the amatory songs. The Latin version of Reynard the Fox¹ has not been able, in the harsh and uncongenial form of Monkish elegiac verse, altogether to quench the drollery of the original. It is written by a man with a singular mastery over the barbarous but expressive Latin of his day, of extraordinary ingenuity in finding apt and fitting phrases for all the strange notions and combinations in this bestial allegory. But "Renardus Vulpes" is manifestly of a late period; it is a bitter satire on Monks and Monkery. The Wolf Isengrim is an Abbot: it contains passages violently and coarsely Antipapal.² It belongs, the Latin version at least, rather perhaps to the class of satiric than of epic Latin poetry.

On the whole, this vast mass of Latin poetry offers no one exception to the eternal irrevocable law, that no great poet is inspired but in his native language. The Crusades were, perhaps happily, too late even to tempt the ambition of the Cloister poets. By that time, the art of Latin versification, if not lost, was not so common: the innate poetry of the subject breaks occasionally through the barbarous but spirited prose of William of Tyre and James de Vitry.

II. The poems on the Lives of the Saints, it might have been supposed, as treating on subjects Lives of the Saints. in which the mythic and imaginative element

¹ Renardus Vulpes. Editio Princeps. Edited by M. Mone. Stuttgard et Tubingæ, 1832.

² This alone would confute (if confutation were necessary) the theory of the editor M. Mone, who attributes the aim of the Satire to certain obscure personages in an obscure but early period in the history of Flemish Gaul. Note, p. 1, *et seq.* The Flemish origin of the poem seems now proved, but the original was clearly Teutonic, not Latin.

of Christianity predominated, would at least display more freedom and originality. They were addressed to the higher emotions, which poetry delights to waken, wonder, sympathy, veneration, pity; they were legends in which noble men and beautiful women, Saints and Holy Virgins, were at issue with power, with cruelty, with fate. The new poetic machinery of Angels and Devils was at the command of the poet; the excited faith of the hearers was ready to accept fiction for truth; to believe the creation of the poet with unsuspecting belief. But legend only reluctantly and ungraciously submitted to the fetters of Latin verse; the artificial form seemed to dull the inspiration. Even in the earliest period, the Saint-Poems and the Martyrdoms (except perhaps some pleasing descriptions in Paulinus of Nola) are, in my judgment, far inferior, even in poetic merit, to the prose legends. I know nothing equal to the Martyrs of Vienne, or the Perpetua and Felicitas, even in the best of Prudentius, who is in general insufferably long, and suffocates all which is noble or touching (and there is much of both) with his fatal copiousness. In later times the lives of St. Boniface, St. Gall, and St. Anschar have more of the imaginative tone of poetry than the hard harsh verses of the period. I should almost say that the Golden Legend awakens more of the emotion of poetry than any of the poetic lives of the mediæval Saints.

III. Even in the Hymnology¹ of the Latin Church, her lyric poetry, it is remarkable, that, with the exception of the Te Deum, those hymns, which have struck,

¹ Compare *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*. H. A. Daniel. Hales, 1841. A copious and excellent collection.

as it were, and cloven to the universal heart of Christendom, are mostly of a late period. The stanzas which the Latin Church has handed down in her services from Prudentius are but the flowers gathered from a wilderness of weeds.¹ The "Pange Lingua Gloriosi" is attributed to Venantius Fortunatus, or Mamertus Claudianus, in the fifth century; the "Stabat Mater" and the "Dies Iræ" are, the first probably by Jacopone da Todi, and the last by Thomas di Celano, in the fourteenth. These two, the one by its tenderness, the other by its rude grandeur, stand unrivalled; in melody, perhaps the hymn of St. Bonaventura to the Cross approaches nearest to their excellences.² As a whole, the Hymnology of the Latin

¹ The two or three stanzas, "Salvete Flores Martyrum," are from the middle of a long, it must be confessed tiresome Poem. Cathem. xii. v. 125. Prudentius, even in Germany, was the great popular author of the Middle Ages; no work but the Bible appears with so many glosses (interpretations or notes) in high German, which show that it was a book of popular instruction. Rodolf Raumer, *Einwirkung Christenthums auf die Althoch Deutsche Sprache*, p. 222. — Seine Hymnen und die des Ambrosius, bilden mit den übrigen Christlichen Lyrikern, das Gesangbuch des mittelalterlichen Klerus. — The hymns of Ambrose were translated into German in the ninth century.

² The two former are too well known to extract. Take two stanzas of the latter: —

"Recordare sanctæ crucis,
Qui perfectam viam ducis,
Delectare jugiter,
Sanctæ crucis recordare,
Et in ipsâ meditare
Insatiabiliter.

"Quum quiescas aut laboras,
Quando rides, quando ploras,
Doles sive gaudeas,
Quando vadis, quando venis,
In solatiis in pœnis
Crucem corde tenens."

Apud Daniel, ii. p. 102.

Of the more general hymns I would select that for the Evening, the "Deus

Church has a singularly solemn and majestic tone. Much of it, no doubt, like the lyric verse of the

Creator Omnium," for its gentle cadence (p. 17); the Paschal Hymn of the Roman Breviary (usually the best), p. 83; In Exequiis Defunctorum (p. 137):—

" Jam moesta quiesce querela,
Lacrimas suspendite matres;
Nullus sua pignora plangat,
Mors hæc reparatio vitæ est.
Quidnam tibi saxa cavata,
Quid pulcra volunt monumenta
Res quod nisi creditur illis,
Non mortua, sed data somno."

Or, the two attributed to St. Bernard, p. 227 and 432, which show the height of his mysticism. Of what are called the Rhythms, by far the finest is that on Paradise, attributed, no doubt without ground, to St. Augustine, more likely by Damiani. It was never chanted in the Church;—

" Ad perennis vitæ fontem mens sitivit arida,
Claustra carnis præsto frangi clausa querit anima:
Ollicit, ambit, eluctatur exul frui patria ?

" Dum pressuris et ærumnis se gemit obnoxiam,
Quam amisit, dum deliquit, contemplatur gloriam,
Præsens malum auget boni perditæ memoriam.

" Nam quis promat summæ pacis quanta sit lætitia,
Ubi vivis margaritis surgunt sedificia,
Auro celsa micant tecta, radiant triclinia :

" Solis gemmis pretiosis hæc structura nectitur,
Auro mundo, tanquam vitro, urbis via sternitur,
Abest limus, deest fimus, lues nulla cernitur

" Hiems horrens, æstas torrens illic nunquam sæviunt,
Flos perpetuus rosarum ver agit perpetuum,
Candent lilia, rubescit crocus, sudat balsamum.

" Virent prata, vernant sata, rivi mellis confluunt,
Pigmentorum spirat odor, liquor et aromatum,
Pendant poma floridorum nec lapsura nemorum.

" Non alternat luna vices, sol vel curans siderum,
Agnus est felix orbis lumen inocciduum.
Nox et tempus desunt ei, diem fert continuum."

Daniel, i. p. 116; and in works of St. Augustine

There are thirteen more stanzas.

Greeks, was twin-born with the music ; it is inseparably wedded with the music ; its cadence is musical rather than metrical. It suggests, as it were, the grave full tones of the chant, the sustained grandeur, the glorious burst, the tender fall, the mysterious dying away of the organ. It must be heard, not read. Decompose it into its elements, coldly examine its thoughts, its images, its words, its versification, and its magic is gone. Listen to it, or even read it with the imagination or the memory full of the accompanying chant, it has an unfelt and indescribable sympathy with the religious emotions, even of those whose daily service it does not constitute a part. Its profound religiousness has a charm to foreign ears, wherever there is no stern or passionate resistance to its power. In fact, all Hymnology, vernacular as well as Latin, is poetry only to predisposed or habituated ears. Of all the lyric verse on the noblest, it might be supposed the most poetic subject, how few hymns take their place in the poetry of any language.

But out of the Hymnology, out of the Ritual, of which the hymns were a considerable part, arose that which was the initiatory, if rude, form of religious tragedy. The Christian Church made some bold advance to be the theatre as well as the temple of the people. But it had an intuitive perception of the danger ; its success appalled its religious sensitiveness. The hymn which, like the Bacchic song of the Greeks, might seem developing into scenic action, and becoming a drama, shrank back into its simpler and more lonely grandeur. The Ritual was content to worship, to teach the facts of the Scripture history only by the Biblical descriptions, and its significant symbolic cere-

monial. Yet the Latin Mysteries, no doubt because they were Latin, maintained in general their grave and serious character. It was when, to increase its power and popularity, the Mystery spoke in the vulgar tongue, that it became vulgar;¹ then buffoonery, at first perhaps from rude simplicity, afterwards from coarse and unrestrained fun, mingled with the sacred subjects. That which ought to have been the highest, noblest tragedy, became tragicomedy, and was gradually driven out by indignant and insulted religion.

In its origin, no doubt the Mystery was purely and essentially religious. What more natural than to attempt, especially as the Latin became more unfamiliar to the common ear, the representation rather than the description of the striking or the awful scenes of the Gospel history, or those in the lives of the Saints; to address the quick, awakened and inthralled eye, rather than the dull and palled ear.² There was already on the walls, in the chapels, in the cloisters, the painting representing the history, not in words, but in act; by gesture, not by speech. What a theatre! Such religious uses could not desecrate buildings so profoundly hallowed; the buildings would rather hallow the spectacle. That theatre was the Church, soaring to its majestic height, receding to its interminable length, broken by its stately divisions, with its countless chap-

¹ See in Warton (the passage is worth reading) the dull buffoonery introduced into the Mystery on the Murder of the Innocents, performed by the English at the Council of Constance. This, however, must have been in Latin, but probably from an English original. — vol. ii. p. 75.

² “*Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.*”

A. P. I. 180

els, and its long cloister, with its succession of concentric arches. What space for endless variety, if not for change of scene! How effective the light and shade, even by daylight; how much more so heightened by the command of an infinity of lamps, torches, tapers, now pouring their full effulgence on one majestic object, now showing rather than enlightening the deep gloom! How grand the music, either pervading the whole space with its rolling volumes of sound, or accompanying some solemn or tender monologue! If it may be said without offence, the company was already enrolled, to a certain degree practised, in the dramatic art; they were used to enforce their words by significant gesture, by movement, by dress. That which was considered the great leap in the Greek drama, the introduction of the second actor, was already done: different parts of the service were assigned to priest, or humbler deacon. The antiphonal chant was the choir breaking into two responsive parts, into dialogue. There were those who recited the principal parts; and, besides them the choir of men or of boys, in the convent of females and young girls; acolyths, mates without number. Take, as an illustration of the effect of these dramas in their simple form, the Massacre of the Innocents.¹ It opens with a procession of Innocents, doubtless children in white robes, who march in long lines, rejoicing, through the long cloister of the Monastery, and chanting, "How glorious is Thy Kingdom! Send down, O God, Thy Lamb." The Lamb immediately appears; a man, with

¹ Published by Mr. Wright — *Early Mysteries*, London, 1838. Several *Latin Mysteries* have been published in Paris, but only a small number of copies by Bibliographical Societies, and so not of general access. But in truth the Poem, the Mystery itself, forms a very subordinate part of these representations.

a banner, bearing the Lamb, takes his place at their head, leading them up and down, in long gleaming procession. Herod (doubtless clad in all the splendor of barbaric and Oriental attire) is seated on his throne. A squire appears, hands him his sceptre, chanting, "On the throne of David." In the mean time, an Angel alights upon the manger, singing, "Joseph, Joseph, Joseph, thou son of David;" and reciting the verse of the Gospel commanding the flight into Egypt, "Weep not, O Egypt." His armor-bearer informs Herod of the departure of the Wise Men: he bursts out into wrath. While he is raging, the children are still following the steps of the Lamb, and sweetly chanting.¹ Herod delivers the fatal sword to his armor-bearer. The Lamb is silently withdrawn; the children remain, in their fearless innocence, singing, "Hail, Lamb of God! O hail!" The mothers entreat mercy. An Angel descends while the slain children are dying, while they lie dead: "Ye who dwell in the dust, awake and cry aloud!" The Innocents answer: "Why, O God, dost thou not defend us from bloodshed?" The Angel chants: "Wait but a little time till your number is full." Then enters Rachel, with two women comforting her: their musical dialogue is simple, wild, pathetic.² As they lead off the sad

¹ Agno qui sancto pro nobis mortificato,
Splendorem patris, splendorem virginitatis,
Offerimus Christo, sub signo numinis leto.

² After her first lament they reply: —

"Noli, Virgo Rachel, noli, dulcissima mater,
Pro nece parvorum fletus retinere dolorum.
Si que tristitia exulta que lacrimis,
Namque tui nati vivunt super astra beati."

RACHEL dolens.

"Heu! heu! heu!"

Quomodo gaudebo, dum mortua membra videbo!

mother, an Angel, hovering above, sings the antiphone, "Suffer little children to come unto me." At the voice of the Angel all the children enter the choir, and take up their triumphant song. Herod disappears; Archelaus is on his throne. The Angel summons Joseph and the Virgin from Egypt. Joseph breaks out into a hymn to the Virgin. The cantor of the Church intones the *Te Deum*; the whole Church rings with the august harmony.

I have chosen this brief and simple episode, as it were, in the Gospel, to show in what spirit, with what aim, and doubtless with what wonderful effect, these sacred representations were introduced in the Middle Ages. But there was no event, however solemn and appalling, up to the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, which was not in like manner wrought into action, preached in this impressive way to awe-struck crowds. Legend, like the Gospels, lent itself to the same purpose: instead of being read, it was thrown

*Dum sic commota fuero per viscera tota !
Me faciunt verè pueri sine fine dolore !
O dolor, o patrum mutataque gaudia matrùm !
Ad lugubres luctus lacrimarum fundite fluctus,
Judææ florem patriæ lacrimando dolorem."*

After some more verses the consolations end: —

*" Numquid flendus est iste
Qui regnum possidet cœlestis !
Quique prece frequente
Misericordis fratribus
Apud Deum auxiliatur."*

Was Rachel represented by a male or a female? A Nun deploring the loss of her children had been somewhat incongruous: Did the Monks and Nuns ever join their companies? In one stage direction it appears the women were personated by men. "*Primum procedunt tres fratres præparati et vestiti in similitudinem trium Mariarum.*" — *Mysterium Resurrectionis*, quoted by M. Onésime de Roy, *Mystères*, p. 4.

*" Gaude, gaude, gaude —
Maria Virgo, cunctas hæreses," &c.*

into a stirring representation, and so offered to spectators as well as to hearers. When all were believers, for those who had not the belief of faith and love, had that of awe and fear, these spectacles no doubt tended most powerfully to kindle and keep alive the religious interest ; to stamp upon the hearts and souls of men the sublime truths, as well as the pious fictions of religion. What remains, the dry skeleton of these Latin mysteries, can give no notion of what they were when alive ; when alive, with all their august, impressive, inthralling accessories, and their simple, unreasoning, but profoundly-agitated hearers. The higher truths, as well as the more hallowed events of our religion, have in our days retired into the reverential depths of men's hearts and souls : they are to be awfully spoken, not, what would now be thought too familiarly, brought before our eyes. Christian tragedy, therefore, could only exist in this early initiatory form. The older Sacred history might endure to be poeticized in a dramatic form, as in the "Samson Agonistes ;" it might even, under certain circumstances, submit to public representation, as in the *Esther* and *Athalie* of Racine, and the *Saul* of Alfieri. A martyrdom like that of *Polyeucte* might furnish noble situations. But the history of the Redeemer, the events on which are founded the solemn mysteries of our religion, must be realized only, as it were, behind the veil ; they will endure no alteration, no amplification, not the slightest change of form or word : with them as with the future world, all is an object of "faith, not of sight."

The abbess of a German convent made a more extraordinary attempt to compel the dramatic art into the service of Latin Christianity. The motive of Hros-

witha, declared by herself, is not less strange than her design.¹ It was to wean the age (as far as we can judge, the age included the female sex—it included nuns, even the nuns of her own rigid order) from the fatal admiration of the licentious comedy of Rome.² “There are persons,” writes the saintly recluse, “who prefer the vanity of heathen books to the Sacred Scriptures, and beguiled by the charms of the language, are constantly reading the dangerous fictions of Terence, and defile their souls with the knowledge of wicked actions.” There is a simplicity almost incredible, but, from its incredibility, showing its perfect simplicity, in Hroswitha’s description not only of her motives but of her difficulties. The holy poetess blushes to think that she too must dwell on the detestable madness of unlawful love, and the fatally tender conversation of lovers. If however she had listened to the voice of modesty, she could not have shown the triumph of divine Grace, as of course Grace in every case obtains its signal triumph. Each of the comedies, instead of its usual close, a marriage, ends with the virgin or the penitent taking the vow of holy celibacy. But in the slender plots the future saints are exposed to trials which it must have been difficult to represent, even to describe, with common decency. Two relate to adventures in which holy hermits set forth in the disguise of amorous youths, to reclaim fallen damsels, literally from the life of a brothel, and bear them off in triumph, but not without resistance, from their sinful calling. Of course the penitents became the holiest of nuns. And the

¹ These plays have been recently edited, and translated into French with great care by M. Magnin. — *Théâtre de Hroswitha*. Paris, 1843.

² Hroswitha wrote also a long poem in hexameters, *Panegyris Odonum*.

curious part of the whole seems to be that these plays on such much more than dubious subjects should not only have been written by a pious abbess, but were acted in the convent, possibly in the chapel of the convent. This is manifest from the stage directions, the reference to stage machinery, the appearance and disappearance of the actors. And nuns, perhaps young nuns, had to personate females whose lives and experiences were certainly most remote from convent discipline.¹ The plays are written in prose, probably because in those days the verse of Terence was thought to be prose: they are slight, but not without elegance of style, derived, it should seem, from the study of that perilously popular author, whom they were intended to supersede. There are some strange patches of scholastic pedantry, a long scene on the theory of music, another on the mystery of numbers, with some touches of buffoonery, strange enough, if acted by nuns before nuns, more strange if acted by others, or before a less select audience, in a convent. A wicked heathen, who is rushing to commit violence on some Christian virgins, is, like Ajax, judicially blinded, sets to kissing the pots and pans, and comes out with his face begrimed with black, no doubt to the infinite merriment of all present. The theatre of Hroswitha is indeed a most curious monument of the times.

No wonder that the severer Churchmen took alarm, and that Popes and Councils denounced these theatric performances, which, if they began in reverent sanctity, soon got beyond the bounds not merely of rev-

¹ See note of M. Magnin (p. 457), in answer to Price, the editor of Warton, ii. 28. M. Magnin has studied with great industry the origin of the Theatre in Europe.

erence, but of decency. But, like other abuses, the reiteration of the prohibition shows the inveterate obstinacy and the perpetual renewal of the forbidden practice.¹ The rapid and general growth of the vernacular Mysteries, rather than the inhibition of Pope and Council, drove out the graver and more serious Latin Mysteries, not merely in Teutonic countries — in England and Germany — but in France, perhaps in Italy.²

Latin, still to a certain extent the vernacular language of the Church and of the cloister, did not confine itself to the grave epic, the hymn, or the Mystery which sprang out of the hymn. The cloisters had their poetry, disguised in Latin to the common ear, and often needing that disguise. Among the most curious, original, and lively of the monkish Latin poems, are those least in harmony with their cold ascetic discipline. Anacreontics and satires sound strangely, though intermingled with moral poems of the same cast, among the disciples of St. Benedict, St. Bernard, and St. Francis. If the cloister had its chronicle and its hymn-

¹ The prohibitions show that the ancient use of masks was continued: — “Interdum ludi fiunt in ecclesiis theatrales, et non solum ad ludibriorum spectacula intropucuntur in eis monstra larvarum, verum etiam in aliquibus festivitibus diaconi, presbyteri ac subdiaconi insanie suæ ludibria exercere præsumunt, mandamus, quatenus ne per hujusmodi turpitudinem ecclesiæ inquinetur honestas, prælibatam ludibriorum consuetudinem, vel potius corruptelam curetis a vestris ecclesiis extirpare.” — Decret. Greg. Boehmer, *Corpus Juris Canon.* t. ii. fol. 418. — “Item, non permittant sacerdotes ludos theatrales fieri in ecclesiâ et alios ludos inhonestos.” — Conc. Trev. A. D. 1227. Hartzheim, iii. p. 529. Compare Synod Dioc. Worm. A. D. 1316. Ibid. iv. p. 258.

² Mary Magdalen was a favorite character in these dramas. Her earlier life was by no means disguised or softened. See the curious extract from a play partly Latin, partly German, published by Dr. Hoffman, *Fundgruben für Geschichte Deutschen Sprache*, quoted by Mr. Wright. Preface to ‘*Early Mysteries.*’ London, 1838.

books, it often had its more profane song-book, and the songs which caught the ear seem to have been propagated from convent to convent.¹ The well-known convivial song, attributed to Walter de Mapes, was no doubt written in England; it is read in the collection of a Bavarian convent.² These, and still more, the same satires, are found in every part of Latin Christendom; they rise up in the most unexpected quarters, usually in a kind of ballad metre, to which Latin lends itself with a grotesque incongruity, sometimes with Leonine, sometimes with more accurate rhyme. The Anacreontic Winebibber's song, too well known to be quoted at length, by no means stands alone: the more joyous monks had other Bacchanalian ditties, not without fancy and gay harmony.³

¹ Among the collections which I have read or consulted on this prolific subject are the old one, of Flaccius Illyricus. — *Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems*, by Thomas Wright. London, 1838. — *Lateinische Gedichte des X. und XI. J. H. von Grimm und And. Schmeller*. Göttingen, 1838. — *Poésies Populaires Latines du Moyen Age*. Edelstan du Meril. Paris, 1847. — *Popular Songs — Poems of Walter de Mapes*. Camden Society by Thomas Wright.

² This Collection, the "*Carmina Benedicto Burena*" (one of the most curious publications of the Stuttgard Union), the Latin Book of Ballads it may be called of the Convent of Benedict Buren, contains many love-verses, certainly of no ascetic tendency; and this, among many other of the coarser monkish satires.

³ "*Mihi est propositum in tabernâ mori,
Vinum sit appositum morientis ori,
Et dicant cum venerint Angelorum chori,
Deus sit propitiâ hunc potatori*"

"*Ave! color vini clari,
Dulcis potus non amari,
Tua nos inebriari
Digneris potentiâ.
O quam felix creatura,
Quam produxit vitis pura,
Omnis mensa sit secunda
In tuâ præsentia.*"

The Anacreons of the cloister did not sing only of wine: they were not silent on that subject, least appropriate, but seemingly not least congenial, to men under the duty, if not under the vow, of perpetual chastity. From the variety and number of these poems, which appear scattered about as freely and carelessly as the moral poems and satires, it might seem that there was a constant interchange between the troubadour or the minnesinger and the ecclesiastic or the monk. Many of the amatory Latin poems are apparently versions, many the originals of those sung by the popular poets in the vulgar tongue; and there can be no doubt about the authorship of most of the Latin poems. They were the growth as they were the amusement of the cloister. They were written for the monks and clergy, to whom alone they were intelligible. It may suffice in a grave history (which, however, as endeavoring to reveal the whole character of past times, cannot altogether decline such topics) to select one of the most curious, certainly the most graceful, of the poems of this class, in its language at least, if not altogether in its moral, inoffensive. It is a kind of Eclogue, in which two fair damsels, Phyllis and Flora,

" O! quam placens in colore!
O! quam fragrans in odore!
O! quam sapidum in ore!
Dulce linguae vinculum!
Felix venter quem entrabis!
Felix guttur quod rigabis!
Felix os quod tu lavabis!
Et beata labia!

" Ergo vinum collaudemus!
Potatores exultemus!
Non potantes confundamus
In aeterna supplicia!"

Wright, p. 120.

one enamored of a Knight, the other of a Clerk, contend for the superior merit of their respective lovers, and submit their cause to the decision of the old heathen god, Cupid. The time of this Idyl is a beautiful noon in spring, its scene a flowery meadow, under the cool shade of a pine by a murmuring stream.¹ The fair champion of the knight taunts the indolence, the luxuriousness, the black dress and shaven crown of the clerk: she dwells on the valor, noble person, bravery, and glory of the knight. The champion of the clerk, on his wealth, superior dignity, even his learning. His tonsure is his crown of dominion over mankind; he is the sovereign of men: the knight is his vassal.² After

¹ It is in the *Carmina Benedicto Burana*, p. 155: —

	6.	
Susurrabat modicum Ventus tempestivus, locus erat viridi gramine festivus,		et in ipso gramine defluebat rivus, brevis atque garrulo Murmure lascivus.
	7.	
Ut puellis noceat Calor solis minus fuit juxta rivulum Spatiosa pinus		venustata foliis, late pandens sinus, nec entrare poterat calor peregrinus.
	8.	
Consedere virgines Herba sedem dedit, Phyllis propè rivulum, Flora longè sedet,		Et dum sedet utraque ac in sese redit, amor corda vulnerat et utramque lædit.
	9.	
Amor est interius latens et occultus, et corde certissimos elicit singultus.		pallor genas inficit, alterantur vultus, sed in verecundiâ furor est sepultus.

² I omit other objections of Phyllis to a clerical lover. This is the worst she can say: —

	29.	
Orbem cum lætificat hora lucis festæ tunc apparet clericus satis inhoneste		in tonsurâ capitis et in atrâ veste portans testimonium voluntatis incoactæ.

some dispute, they mount, one a fine mule, the other a stately palfrey, and set off, both splendidly accoutred, to the Court of the God of Love. The Paradise of Cupid is described rapidly, but luxuriantly, with much elegance, and a profusion of classical lore. Silenus is not forgotten. The award is in favor of the clerk; an award which designates him as fitter for love: and this award is to be valid to all future times.¹ Few will

To this Flora rejoins:—

37.

Non dicas opprobrium
Si cognoscas morem,
vestem nigram clerici
comam breviorē;

habet ista clericus
ad summum honorem,
ut sese significet
omnibus majorem.

38.

Univerſa clerico
Constat esse prona,
et signum imperii
portat in coronā,

imperat militibus,
et largitur dona,
ſamulante major eſt
imperans perſona.

39.

otioſum clericum
ſemper eſſe juraſ,
viles ſpernit operas
ſateor et duras,

ſed cum ejus animuſ
Evolat ad curas,
coeli vias dividit
et rerum naturaſ.

40.

Meuſ eſt in purpurā,
tuuſ in lorica;
tuuſ eſt in proello
meuſ in lectica,

ubi ſacta principum
recolit antiqua,
ſcribit, quaerit, cogitat—
totum de amica.

¹ The cloſe iſ delightfully naïve. I muſt only ſubjoin the award:—

78.

Fiunt et juſtitiaſ,
ventilant vigorem
ventilant et retrahunt

Curiaſ rigorem
ſecundum ſcientiam
et ſecundum morem,

79.

ad amoreſ clericuſ
dicunt aptioreſ.
Comprobavit curiaſ,

ditionem juriſ,
et teneri voluit
etiā futuris.

This poem iſ alſo in Mr. Wright's Engliſh collection, who haſ ſubjoined a translation of the time of Queen Elizabeth, with very many of the beautieſ, ſome of the faultſ of that age.

question whence came this poem: that any layman should be so studious, even in irony, of clerical interests, can scarcely be suspected. If the ballad poetry of a people, or of a time, be the best illustration of their history, this poem, without doubt, is significant enough.

It were unjust not to add that there is a great mass of this rhyme, not less widely dispersed, of much more grave and religious import — poems which embody the truths and precepts of the faith, earnest admonitions on the duties of the clergy, serious expostulations on the sufferings and oppressions of the poor, moral reflections on the times. The monkish poets more especially dwelt on the Crusades. Though there was no great poem on the subject, there were songs of triumph at every success — at every disaster a wild poetic wail.¹ The Crusade was perpetually preached in verse, half hymn, half war-song.²

Yet, after all, the strength of these Monk-Poets was in satire. They have more of Juvenal, if not of his majestic march and censorial severity, of his pitilessness, of his bitterness, it may be said of his truculency, than of Catullus, Terence, or Horace. The invectives

¹ *Carmina Benedicto Barana*, xxli. to xxviii.: —

Agedum Christicola,
surge vides
Ne de fide
reputeris frivola,
seda martyr in agone,
spe mercedis et coronae,
derelicta Babylone
pugna
pro coelesti regione
et ad vitam te compone
Pugna.

xxvi. on the conquests of Saladin; and in *Edelstan du Nord's Cal-
-Lectare Hierusalem.*

against Rome, against her pride, avarice, venality — against Popes and Cardinals — against the Hierarchy, its pomp, its luxury — against the warlike habits of the Prelates, the neglect of their holy duties — even against the Monks, put to the test their rude nerve and vigor ; and these poems in the same or in similar strain turn up out of the convent libraries in many parts of Germany, in France, in England, in every country beyond the Alps (Italy mostly expressed her Antipapal passions in other ways). They are of all ages ; they have the merit that they are the outpourings of overburdened hearts, and are not the frigid and artificial works of mechanics in Latin verse ; they are genial even in their ribaldry ; they are written by men in earnest, bitterly deploring or mercilessly scourging the abuses of the Church. Whether from righteous indignation or malignity, from moral earnestness or jealousy and hatred of authority, whether its inspiration was holy and generous or sordid and coarse, or, as in most human things, from mingling and contradictory passions, the monkish Latin satire maintained its unretracted protest against the Church. The Satirists impersonated a kind of bold reckless antagonist against Rome and the hierarchy,¹ confounding together in their Goliath, as Rabelais in later days, solemnity and buffoon-

¹ Mr. Wright has abundantly proved this in his preface to the Poems of Walter de Mapes. (Introd. p. ix., &c.) He is equally successful, according to my judgment, in depriving of the glory, or relieving from the reproach, of these compositions the celebrated Walter de Mapes. De Mapes had a feud with the Cistercians or White Monks, and did not spare his enemies ; but he was not Goliath. Under that name ranked bards of a considerable period, and in my opinion of more than one country. Mr. Wright is not so satisfactory in claiming them all for England : one poem seems to show itself written in Pavia. Compare the copy of the Confession in Wright (p. 71), and the Carmina Benedicto Burana (p. 57).

ery, pedantic learning and vulgar humor, a profound respect for sacred things and freedom of invective against sacred persons. The Goliards became a kind of monkish rhapsodists, the companions and rivals of the Jongleurs (the reciters of the merry and licentious fabliaux); Goliardery was a recognized kind of mediæval poetry. Goliard has his *Metamorphoses*, his *Apocalypse*, his terrible *Preachment*, his *Confession*,¹ his *Complaint to the Pope*, his *Address to the Roman Court*, to the impious Prelates, to the Priests of Christ, to the Prelates of France; and, finally, a *Satire on women*, that is, against taking a wife, instinct with true monastic rigor and coarseness. Towards the Pope himself—though Goliard scruples not to arraign his avarice, to treat his Bulls with scorn—there is yet some awe.² I doubt if the Roman Pontiff was yet to

¹ The *Confession* contains the famous drinking song. The close is entirely different, and shows the sort of common property in the poems. Both poems mention Pavia. Yet the English copy names the Bishop of Coventry, the German "the Elect of Cologne," as Diocesan.

² I have already quoted the lines in one of those songs in which he derives the word *Papa*, by apocope, from *pagare*, "pay, pay." In his complaint to the Pope, Goliard is a poor clerical scholar poet:—

Turpe tibi, pastor bone,
Si divina lectione
Spretâ nam laicus,
Vel absolve clericoatu,
Vel fac ut in cleri statu,
Perseverem clericus.
Dulcis erit mihi status,
Si prebenda muneratus
Redditu vel alio,
Vivam licet non habunde,
Saltem mihi detur unde,
Studeam de proprio.

From a very different author in a different tone is the following:—

1.

Dio Xti veritas,
Dio cara raritas,

the fiercest of these poets, as to the Albigensians and to the Spiritual Franciscans, Antichrist. The Cardi-

*Die rare charitas,
Ubi nunc habitas?
Aut in valle Vidonia,
Aut in throno Pharaonis,
Aut in alto cum Narone,
Aut in entro cum Timone,
Vel in viscera scirpæ
Cum Moyse plorante,
Vel in domo Romulæ
Cum bullâ fulminante.*

2.

*Bella fulminante
Sub iudice tonante,
Reo appellante,
Sententia gravante,
Veritas opprimitur,
Distrahitur et venditur,
Justitia prostante,
Itur et recurritur
Ad curiam, nec ante
Quis quid consequatur
Donec exultur
Ultimo quadrante.*

3.

*Respondit Caritas
Homo quid dubitas,
Quid me sollicitas?
Non sum quod uistas,
Nec in euro, nec in austro,
Nec in foro, nec in clauastro,
Nec in bymo, nec in cuculla,
Nec in bello, nec in bulla,
De Jericho sum veniens.
Floro cum sauciato
Quem duplex Levi transiens
Non astitit grabato.*

Carmina Benedicte Barana, p. 51

One of these stanzas is contained in a long poem made up callously from a number of small poems (in Flaccius Illyricus, p. Papal absolution and indulgences:—

*Nos peccata relaxamus
Absolutos collocamus
Sedibus æthereis,
Nos habemus nostras leges,
Alligantes omnes reges
In manichæ aureis.*

Carm., B. B., p. 17.

ect; that excessive and proverbial
have heard denounced century
ned, if it needed confirmation,
rists.¹

ill arraigned for their martial
f their sacred functions, their
eir tyranny. Some were mar-
l concubinage is the burden of

m. Wright, p. 217. *Carmina B. B.* 18:—

2.

di caput mundi
maris et profund
guttur Siculi;
ndi bithalasens,
bet aurum Crassus
ntum seculi.

* * *
ma galearum
pursus piratarum
cardinalium.

* * *

25.

ales ut pœdixi,
nre Crucifixi
nt patrimonium,
foris, intus Nero,
upa, foris vare
gni ovium.

ens.

é cornuti
ere muti,
iam sunt parati
inter coronati
2 farunt lanceam,
illâ galeam,
pro stollâ,
ortis erit mole)
pro albâ,
nato calva,
pro humerali,
seculari
artes incedunt,
discedunt, &c.

the complaint against the Clergy.¹ The Satirists are stern monks to others, however their amatory poetry may tell against themselves.² The Archdeacons' Court is a grievance which seems to have risen to a great height in England. Henry II. we have heard bitterly complaining against its abuses: it levied enormous sums on the vices of the people, which it did not restrain.³

Carm. B. Barana, p. 15. Compare Wright, *Sermo Golia ad Prælatos*, p. 42.

¹ *Nec tu participes
Conjugis vitæ vitæ
Namque multos invenio
qui sunt hujus participes,
seclularum principes.*

² *O sacerdos hæc responde.
qui frequenter et jocunde
cum uxore dormis, unde
Mane surgens, missam dicis,
corpus Christi benedixis,
post amplexus meretricis,
minus quam tu peccatrixis.*

* * * *

*Miror ego, miror plane
quod sub illo latet pæne
Corpus Christi, quod prophane
Tractat manus illa mana,
Miror, ubi tu mireris,
quod a terrâ non sorberis,
cumque sæpe prohiberis
literare non vereris.*

Wright, pp. 49, 50.

³ Compare in Wright the three curious poems, *De Concubinâ Sacerdotum*, *Consultatio Sacerdotum*, *Convocatio Sacerdotum*, pp. 171, 174, 18

*Ecos capitulum legi de moribus
Archidiaconi, qui suis visibus
quicquid a puerculis evadit manibus
Capit et lacerat rostris et unguibus.*

*Ille plenus oculis sedet ad synodum,
Lynx ad insidias, Janus ad ecomodum,
Argus ad animi scelus omnimodum,
Et Polyphemus est ad artis methodum.*

*Doctorem statuit decerni militem,
Quorum est pondus supra jus jarium,*

All are bitterly reproached with the sale of the services of the Church, even of the Sacraments.¹ The monks do not escape ; but it seems rather a quarrel of different Orders than a general denunciation of all.

The terrible preachment of Golias on the Last Judgment ought not to be passed by. The rude doggerel rises almost to sublimity as it summons all alike before the Judge, clerk as well as layman ; and sternly cuts off all reply, all legal quibble, all appeal to the throne of St. Peter. The rich will find no favor before Him who is the Judge, the Author of the sentence, the Witness. God the Judge will judge Judges, he will judge Kings ; be he Bishop or Cardinal, the sinner will be plunged into the stench of hell. There will be no fee for Bull or Notary, no bribe to Chamberlain or Porter. Prelates will be delivered up to the most savage tormentors ; their life will be eternal death.²

Unum qui solverit, reus est omnium,
Nisi resolverit prius marsupium

• • • • •

Ecclesiastica jura venalia,
facit propatulo, sed venialis
cum venum dederit, vocat a venâ
quam non inveniens venit Ecclesia.

Wright, p. 9.

¹ Jacet ordo clericallis
in respectu laicalis,
spina Christi sit mercallis
generosa generalis
Veneunt altaria,
venit eucharistia,
cum sit nugatoria
gratia venalis.

Carmin. B. Burana, p. 41.

This and the following poems dwell on simony of all kinds. See the Poem De Crisis Monachis, Wright, p. 54. De Clarevallensibus et Cluniacensibus, ib. p. 237. De Malis Monachorum, 187.

² Quid dicturi miseri sumus ante thronum,
Ante tantum judicem, ante summum bonum ;

History throughout these centuries bore on its face that it was the work not of the statesman ^{Latin} or the warrior, unless of the Crusader or of ^{history.} the warrior Bishop, it was that of the Monk. It is universally Latin during the earlier period: at first indeed in Italy, in Latin which may seem breaking down into an initiatory Romance or Italian. Erchempert and the Salernitan Chronicle, and some others of that period, are barbarous beyond later barbarism. When history became almost the exclusive property of the Monks, it was written in their Latin, which at least was a kind of Latin. Most of the earlier Chronicles were intended each to be a universal history for the instruction of the brotherhood. Hence monkish historians rarely begin lower than the Creation or the Deluge. According to the erudition of the writer, the historian is more or less diffuse on the pre-Christian History, and that of the Cæsars. As the writers approach their own

Tunc non erit aliquis locus hic præconum,
Cum nostrarum præmia reddet actionum.

Cum perventum fuerit examen veri,
Ante thronum stabimus iudicis severi,
Nec erit distinctio laici vel cleri.
Nulla nos exceptio poterit tueri.

Hic non erit licitum quicquam allegare,
Neque jus rejicere, neque replicare,
Nec ad Apostolicam sedem appellare,
Reus tunc damnabitur, nec dicetur quare.

Cogitate divites qui vel quales estis,
Quod in hoc iudicio facere potestis;
Tunc non erit aliquis locus hic Digestis,
Idem erit Deus hic iudex, autor, testis,
Iudicabit iudices iudex generalis,
Nihil ibi proderit dignitas regalis;
Sed factorem sentiet poenæ gehennalis,
Sive sit Episcopus, sive Cardinalis.

Nihil ibi dabitur bullæ vel scriptori,
Nihil camerario, nihil jaultori;
Sed dabuntur præsules pessimo tortori,
Quibus erit vivere sine fine mori.

Wright, p. 52.

age, the brief Chronicle expands and registers at first all that relates to the institution and interests of the monastery, its founders and benefactors, their lives and miracles, and condescends to admit the affairs of the times in due subordination. But there is still something of the legend. Gradually, however, the actual world widens before the eyes of the monkish historian; present events in which he, his monastery, at all events the Church, are mingled, assume their proper magnitude. The universal-history preface is sometimes actually discarded, or shrinks into a narrower compass. He is still a chronicler; he still, as it were, surveys everything from within his convent-walls, but the world has entered within his convent. The Monk has become a Churchman, or the Churchman, retired into the monastery, become almost an historian. The high name of Historian, indeed, cannot be claimed for any mediæval Latin writer; but as chroniclers of their own times (their value is entirely confined to their own times; on the past they are merely servile copyists of the same traditions) they are invaluable.¹ Their very faults are their merits. They are full of, and therefore represent the passions, the opinions, the prejudices, the partialities, the animosities of their days. Every kingdom, every city in Italy, in Germany every province, has its chronicler.² In England, though the residence of the chronicler, the order to which he belongs, and the office which he occupies, are usually manifest, it is more often the affairs of the realm which occupy the annals. France, or rather the Franco-Teutonic Empire, began

¹ *E. g.* in the Saxon Chronicle.

² To characterize the Chronicles, even those of the different nations, would be an endless labor.

with better promise ; Eginhard has received his due praise ; the Biographers of Louis the Pious, Thegan, and the Astronomer, may be read with pleasure as with instruction : Nithard falls off. In England Matthew Paris, or rather perhaps Roger of Wendover, takes a wider range : he travels beyond the limits of England ; he almost aspires to be a chronicler of Christendom. The histories of the Crusades are lively, picturesque, according as they come directly from the Crusaders themselves. Perhaps the most elaborate, William of Tyre, being a compilation, is least valuable and least effective. Lambert of Hertzfeld (vulgarly of Aschaffenburg) in my judgment occupies, if not the first, nearly the first place, in mediæval history. He has risen at least towards the grandeur of his subject. Our own chroniclers, Westminster, Knighton, and Walsingham, may vie with the best of other countries. As to their Latinity, Saxo Grammaticus, the Sicilian Ugo Falcandus, command a nobler and purer style.

Yet after all the Chronicle must, to attain its perfection, speak in the fresh picturesqueness, the freedom, and the energy of the new vernacular languages. The Latin, though in such universal use, is a foreign, a conventional tongue even among Churchmen and in the monastery. Statesmen, men of business, men of war, must begin to relate the affairs of States, the adventures and events of war. For the perfect Chronicle we must await Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart. Villani is more than a chronicler ; he is approaching to the historian.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN LETTERS IN THE NEW LANGUAGES OF EUROPE.

CHRISTIANITY, indeed, must await, and not in history alone, the creation, growth, perfection of new languages, before she can become the parent of genuine Christian letters and arts — of letters and arts which will maintain permanent influence and ascendancy over the mind of man. But the abrogation of the Latin as the exclusive language of Christian letters and arts must be inevitably and eventually the doom of Latin Christianity. Latin must recede more and more into a learned language understood by the few. It may linger in the religious service of all who adhere to the Church of Rome, not absolutely unintelligible to those whose language is of Latin descent, and among them with a kind of mysterious and venerable indistinctness not unfavorable to religious awe. The Latin is a congenial part of that imposing ritual system which speaks by symbolic gestures and genuflexions, by dress, by music, by skilful interchange of light and darkness, by all which elevates, soothes, rules the mind through the outward senses. A too familiar Liturgy and Hymnology might disturb this vague, unreasoning reverence. With the coarsest and most vulgar Priesthood these services cannot become altogether vulgar ; and except to the strongest or most practical minds, the clear and

the definite are often fatal to the faith. Yet for popular instruction either from the Pulpit or through the Printing Press, Christianity must descend, as it does descend, to the popular language. In this respect Latin has long discharged its mission — it is antiquated and obsolete.

But while the modern languages of Europe survive; and we can hardly doubt the vitality of French, Italian, Spanish, German, and our own English (now the vernacular tongue of North America and Australia, that too of government and of commerce in vast regions of Africa and Asia), the great Christian writers, Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Calderon; Pascal, Bossuet, and the pulpit orators of France, with Corneille and Racine; the German Bible of Luther, the English Bible, Shakespeare, Milton, Schiller, some of our great divines, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, will only die with the languages in which they wrote. Descartes, Bacon, Locke, Reid, Kant, will not share the fate of the scholastic philosophers, till the French, English and German are to new races of men what mediæval Latin is to us. And religion must speak to mankind in the dominant languages of mankind.

It might seem indeed that in the earliest Latin as distinguished from the Teutonic languages, the Romance in its various forms, Sicilian, Italian, Catalan, Provençal, poetry, the primal form of vernacular literature was disposed to break loose from Latin Christianity, from hierarchical unity, even from religion. The Clergy in general remained secluded or shrunk back into the learned Latin; the popular poetry, even the popular prose, became profane, unreligious, at length in some part irreligious. The Clergy, as has been seen, for their own use and amusement, trans-

muted much of the popular poetry into Latin, but it ceased thereby to be popular except among themselves. They shut themselves up from the awakening and stirring world in their sanctity, their authority, their learning, their wealth. The Jongleurs, the Trouvères, the Troubadours, became in a certain sense the popular teachers, the Bards and the sacerdotal order became separate, hostile to each other. The Clergy might seem almost content with the intellect of man; they left the imagination, except so far as it was kept enthralled by the religious ceremonial, to others. Perhaps the Mysteries, even the early Latin Mysteries, chiefly arose out of the consciousness of this loss of influence; it was a strong effort to recover that which was gliding from their grasp. Some priests were Troubadours, not much to the elevation of their priestly character; Troubadours became priests, but it was by the renunciation of their poetic fame; and by setting themselves as far asunder as possible from their former brethren. Fulk of Marseilles¹ became the furious persecutor of those who had listened with rapture to his poetry. Later one of the most famous of the schoolmen was said to have been a Troubadour.²

Chivalry alone, so far as chivalry was Christian, held poetry to the service of Christianity, and even of the

¹ For the history of Fulk of Marseilles, whose poetic fame endured to the days of Dante, see back, vol. iv. p. 112.

² No less a person than William Durand, the great general of the Pope, the great Ecclesiastical Legist, almost the last great Schoolman, the author of the *Speculum* and the *Rationale*, is traditionally reported to have been a Troubadour. A tale is told of him very similar to that of Romeo and Juliet. Conceive Romeo growing up into a High Churchman and a Schoolman! — Ritter, *Christliche Philosophie*, vii. p. 19. The question is examined with fairness and sagacity in the xx.th vol. of the *Hist. Lit. de la France*, p. 435.

Church ; but this was chiefly among the Trouvères of Northern France or the Langue d'Oil. The Provençal poetry of the South, the cradle of modern song, contains some noble bursts of the Crusading religious sentiment ; it is Christian, if chivalry be Christian, in tone and thought. But, in general, in the castle courts of the Provençal Princes and Nobles poetry not only set itself above Christian religion, but above Christian morals. The highest Idealism was amatory Platonism, which while it professed religious adoration of woman, degraded her by that adoration. It may be doubted whether it could ever have broken forth from that effeminacy to which it had condemned itself. Grace, perhaps tenderness, was its highest aim ; and Poetry soars not above its aim. But this subject has already found its place in our history. In its lower and popular form Provençal poetry, not less immoral, was even more directly anti-hierarchical. It was not heretical, for it had not religion enough to be heretical : religion was left to the heretic. The Fabliau, the Satire, the Tale, or the Song, were the broad and reckless expression of that aversion and contempt into which the Clergy of Southern France had fallen, and tended immeasurably to deepen that aversion and contempt. But it has been sadly shown how the Albigensian war crushed the insurrection of Provençal poetry against Latin letters, together with the insurrection against the Latin hierarchy. The earliest vernacular poetry perished almost without heirs to its fame ; its language, which once divided France, sunk into a provincial dialect.¹

¹ Even in our days Provence has a poet, and that of no undeserved fame
Jasmin: of course, the language has undergone much change.

Christendom owes to Dante the creation of Italian Poetry, through Italian, of Christian Poetry. It required all the courage, firmness, and prophetic sagacity of Dante to throw aside the inflexible bondage of the established hierarchical Latin of Europe. He had almost yielded and had actually commenced the Divine Comedy in the ancient, it seemed, the universal and eternal language.¹ But the Poet had profoundly meditated, and deliberately resolved on his appeal to the Italian mind and heart. Yet even then he had to choose, to a certain extent to form, the pure, vigorous, picturesque, harmonious Italian which was to be intelligible, which was to become native and popular to the universal ear of Italy. He had to create; out of a chaos he had to summon light.² Every kingdom,

¹ Compare among other authorities the valuable essay of Perticari, the son-in-law of Monti (in Monti, *Proposta di alcune Correzioni, &c. al Vocab. della Crusca*, v. ii. pte ii.). Perticari quotes the very curious letter of the Monk Ilario to Ugucione della Faggiuola. To this Monk the wandering Dante showed part of his great work. The Monk was astounded to see that it was written in the vulgar tongue. "Io mi stupiva ch' egli avesse cantato in quella lingua, perchè pareva cosa difficile, anzi da non credere, chè quegli altissimi intendimenti si potessero significare per parole di vulgo; ne mi pareva convenire chè una tanta e si degna scienza fosse vestita a quel modo sì plebeo." Dante replied, that so he himself had originally thought. He had once begun his poem in Latin, and these were the lines —

"Ultima regna canam, fluido contermina mundo,
Spiritus quæ lata patent, quæ præmia solvunt
Pro meritis cuicunque suls."

But he had thrown aside that lyre, "ed un'altra ne temperai conveniente all' orecchio de' moderni." The Monk concludes "molte altre cose con sublimi affetti soggiunse" (p. 328). Perticari quotes another remonstrance addressed to the poet by Giovanni di Virgilio da Cesena, closing with these words: "Se te giova la fama non sii contento a sì brevi confini nè all' esser fatto glorioso dal vil giudizio del volgo" (p. 330). Conceive the Divine Comedy stranded, with Petrarch's Africa, high on the barren and unapproachable shore of ecclesiastical Latin.

² "Poscia nel libro ch' ei nomina del Vulgare Eloquenza, cominciò ad illustrare l'idioma poetico ch' egli creava." See the excellent observations on writing in a dead language, Foscolo, *Discorso sul Testo di Dante*, p. 250.

every province, every district, almost every city, had its dialect, peculiar, separate, distinct, rude in construction, harsh, in different degrees, in utterance. Dante in his book on *Vulgar Eloquence* ranges over the whole land,¹ rapidly discusses the Sicilian and Apulian, the Roman and Spoletan, the Tuscan and Genoese, the Romagnole and the Lombard, the Trevisan and Venetian, the Istrian and Friulian; all are coarse, harsh, mutilated, defective. The least bad is the vulgar Bolognese. But high above all this discord he seems to discern, and to receive into his prophetic ears, a noble and pure language, common to all, peculiar to none, a language which he describes as *Illustrious, Cardinal, Courtly*, if we may use our phrase, *Parliamentary*, that is, of the palace, the courts of justice, and of public affairs.² No doubt it sprung, though its affiliation is by no means clear, out of the universal degenerate Latin, the rustic tongue, common not in Italy alone, but in all the provinces of the Roman Empire.³ Its first domicile was the splendid

¹ I can have no doubt whatever of the authenticity of the *de Vulgari Eloquentiâ*; contested because Dante threw aside the vulgar Tuscan or Florentine as disdainfully as the rest, and even preferred the Bolognese. To a stranger it is extraordinary that such an Essay as that of Perticari should be necessary to vindicate Dante from the charge of ingratitude and want of patriotism, even of hatred of Florence (Florence which had exiled him), because Florentine vanity was wounded by what they conceived injustice to pure Tuscan. See also the Preface to the *de Vulgari Eloquentiâ* in the excellent edition of the *Opera Minora* by Fraticelli. Florence, 1833.

² *Itaque adepti quod querebamus, dicimus, Illustre, Cardinale, Aulicum et Curiale Vulgare in Latio, quod omnis Latine civitatis est et nullius esse videtur, et quo municipia Vulgaria omnia Latinorum mensurantur, ponderantur et comparantur. — Lib. i. cxvi.*

³ Perticari has some ingenious observations on the German conquests, and the formation of Italian from the Latin. The German war-terms were alone admitted into the language. But his theory of the origin of the Romance out of the ecclesiastical Latin and still more his notion that the ecclesiastical Latin was old *lingua rustica*, rest on two

Sicilian and Apulian Court of Frederick II., and of his accomplished son. It has been boldly said, that it was part of Frederick's magnificent design of universal empire: he would make Italy one realm, under one king, and speaking one language.¹ Dante does homage to the noble character of Frederick II.² Sicily was the birthplace of Italian Poetry. The Sicilian Poems live to bear witness to the truth of Dante's assertion, which might rest on his irrefragable authority alone. The Poems, one even earlier than the Court of Frederick,³

bold and unproved assumptions, though doubtless there is some truth in both: "*La fina industria degli Ecclesiastici, che in Romano spiegando la dottrina Evangelica, ed in Romano scrivendo i fatti della chiesa cattolica, facevano del Romano il linguaggio pontifical e Cattolica cioè universale. Ma quella non era più il Latino illustre; non l' usato da Lucrezio e da Tullio, non l' udito nel Senato e nella Corte di Cesare; era quel rustico che parlava l' intero volgo dell' Europa Latina*" (p. 92). Still I know no treatise on the origin of the Italian language more full, more suggestive, or more valuable than Perticari's.

¹ "Federigo II. sperava a riunire l' Italia sotto un solo principe, una sola forma di governo, e una sola lingua." — Foscolo sulla lingua Italiana, p. 159. This essay, printed (1850) in the fourth volume of my poor friend's Works, has only just reached me.

² Quicquid poetantur Itali Sicilianum vocatur Sed hæc fama Trinacriæ terræ, si recte signum ad quod tendit inspicimus, videtur tantum in opprobrium Italorum Principum remansisse qui non heroico more, sed plebeo sequuntur superbiam. Siquidem illustres heroes Fredericus Cæsar, et bene genitus ejus Manfredus nobilitatem ac rectitudinem suæ formæ perdentes, donec fortuna permansit, humana secuti sunt, brutalia dedignantur, propter quod corde nobiles atque gratiarum dotati inhærere tantorum principum majestati conati sunt: ita quod eorum tempore quicquid excellentes Latinorum nitebantur, primitus in tantorum Coronatorum aulâ prodibat. Et quia regale solum erat Sicilia, factum est quicquid nostri prædecessores vulgariter protulerunt, Sicilianum vocatur. Quod quidem retinemus et nos, nec posterius nostri permutare valebunt, Racha! Racha! Quid nunc personat tuba novissimi Frederici? quid tintinnabulum II. Caroli? quid cornua Johannis et Azzonis Marchionum potentum? quid aliorum Magnatum tibiæ? nisi Venite carnifices! Venite altriplices! Venite avaritiæ sectatores. Sed præstat ad propositum repedare quam frustra loqui. — De Vulgar. Eloquio, i. xii. p. 45. There is a splendid translation of this passage in Dantesque Italian by Foscolo, Discorso, p. 255.

³ See the Rosa fresca olentissima, Foscolo, della Lingua, p. 150.

those of Frederick himself, of Pietro della Vigna,¹ of King Enzo, of King Manfred, with some peculiarities in the formation, orthography, use and sounds of words, are intelligible from one end of the peninsula to the other.² The language was echoed and perpetuated, or rather resounded spontaneously, among poets in other districts. This courtly, aristocratical, universal Italian Dante heard as the conventional dialect in the Courts of the Cæsars,³ in the republics, in the principalities throughout Italy.⁴ Perhaps Dante, the Italian, the

¹ Così ne' versi seguenti non v'è un unico sgrammaticamento de sintassi, nè un modo d' esprimersi inelegante, nè un solo vocabolo che possa parere troppo antico.

“ Non dico che alla vostra gran bellezza
Orgoglio non convegna e stiale bene,
Che a bella donna orgoglio ben conviene,
Che la mantene — in pregio ed in grandezza:
Troppo alterezza — e quella che sconviene.
Di grande orgoglio mai bel non avviene.”

Poeti del 1^{mo} Sec. I. p. 195.

See Foscolo, p. 166.

Peter della Vigna (Peter de Vinca) did not write Sicilian from want of command of Latin: his letters, including many of the State Papers of his master Frederick II., are of a much higher Latinity than most of his time.

² See the passages from Frederick II. and King Enzo, Foscolo, p. 165.

³ See, among other instances, the pure Italian quoted from Angelati by Perticari, written at Milan the year before the birth of Dante. Perticari's graceful essay, as far as the earlier Italian poetry may be compared with that of Foscolo, *sulla Lingua*; the other poets Cino da Pistoia, the Guidos (Foscolo ranks Guido Cavalcanti, Dante's best friend, very high) may be read in a collection printed at Florence, referred to in a former volume. Nor must the prose be forgotten; the history of Matteo Spinelli is good universal Italian. The maritime code of Amalfi has been recently discovered, in Italian perfectly intelligible in the present day. I owe this information to my accomplished friend Signr. Lacaita.

⁴ La lingua ch' ei nomina cortegiana, e della quale ei disputa tuttavia, la sua fortuna vedevola nascere ed ampliarsi per la perpetua residenza de' Cesari in Roma, e frà le repubbliche e le tirannidi, tutte confuse in un sol reame. Di questo ci ti pare certissimo come di legge preordinata della Provvidenza e connessa al sistema del' Universo. — Compare quotations, Foscolo, *Discorso*, p. 254.

Ghibelline, the assertor of the universal temporal monarchy, dwelt not less fondly in his imagination on this universal and noble Italian language, because it would supersede the Papal and hierarchical Latin; the Latin with the Pope himself, would withdraw into the sanctuary, into the service of the Church, into affairs purely spiritual.

However this might be, to this vehicle of his noble thoughts Dante fearlessly intrusted his poetic immortality, which no poet anticipated with more confident security. While the scholar Petrarch condescended to the vulgar tongue in his amatory poems, which he had still a lurking fear might be but ephemeral, in his *Africa* and in his Latin verses he laid up, as he fondly thought, an imperishable treasure of fame.¹ Even Boccaccio, happily for his own glory, followed the example of Dante, as he too probably supposed in his least enduring work, his gay *Decamerone*. Yet Boccaccio doubted, towards the close of his life, whether the *Divine Comedy* had not been more sublime, and therefore destined to a more secure eternity in Latin.²

Thus in Italy, with the Italian language, of which, if he was not absolutely the creator, he was the first who gave it permanent and vital being, arose one of

¹ Compare Petrarch's letter (*Epist. Fam. xi. 12*), in which he haughtily vindicates himself from all jealousy of Dante. How should he, who is the companion of Virgil and Homer, be jealous of one who enjoys the hoarse applause of taverns and markets. I may add that Mr. Bruce Whyte, in his curious volumes, *Histoire des Langues Romanes*, has given a careful analysis of Petrarch's "*Africa*," which he has actually read, and discovered some passages of real merit (*vol. iii. ch. xl.*).

² "Non dico però che se in versi Latini fosse (non mutato il peso dalle parole vulgari) ch' egli non fosse molto più artificioso e più sublime: perciò ch'è molto più arte e nel parlare latino ch'è nel moderno." — Boccac. *Comm. Div. Com. f. f.* As if sublimity in poetry consisted in skilful triumph over difficulty. But on the old age of Boccaccio, see Foscolo, p. 212.

the great poets of the world. There is a vast chasm between the close of Roman and the dawn of Italian letters, between the period at which appeared the last creative work written by transcendent human genius in the Roman language, while yet in its consummate strength and perfection, and the first, in which Italian Poetry and the Italian tongue came forth in their majesty; between the history of Tacitus and the *Divina Commedia*. No one can appreciate more highly than myself (if I may venture to speak of myself), the great works of ecclesiastical Latin, the Vulgate, parts of the Ritual, St. Augustine: yet who can deny that there is barbarism, a yet unreconciled confusion of uncongenial elements, of Orientalism and Occidentalism, in the language? From the time of Trajan, except Claudian, Latin letters are almost exclusively Christian; and Christian letters are Latin, as it were, in a secondary and degenerate form. The new era opens with Dante.

To my mind there is a singular kindred and similitude between the last great Latin, and the ^{Tacitus and Dante.} first great Italian writer, though one is a poet, the other an historian. Tacitus and Dante have the same penetrative truth of observation as to man and the external world of man; the same power of expressing that truth. They have the common gift of flashing a whole train of thought, a vast range of images on the mind by a few brief and pregnant words; the same faculty of giving life to human emotions by natural images, of imparting to natural images, as it were, human life and human sympathies: each has the intuitive judgment of saying just enough; the stern self-restraint which will not say more than enough; the rare talent of compressing a mass of profound thought

into an apophthegm ; each paints with words, with the fewest possible words, yet the picture lives and speaks. Each has that relentless moral indignation, that awful power of satire which in the historian condemns to an immortality of earthly infamy, in the Christian Poet aggravates that gloomy immortality of this world by ratifying it in the next. Each might seem to embody remorse.¹ Patrician, high, imperial, princely, Papal criminals are compelled to acknowledge the justice of their doom. Each, too, writing, one of times just passed, of which the influences were strongly felt in the social state and fortunes of Rome : the other of his own, in which he had been actively concerned, throws a personal passion (Dante of course the most) into his judgments and his language, which, whatever may be its effect on their justice, adds wonderfully to their force and reality. Each, too, has a lofty sympathy with good, only that the highest ideal of Tacitus is a death-defying Stoic, or an all-accomplished Roman Proconsul, an Helvidius Thrasea, or an Agricola ; that of Dante a suffering, and so purified and beatified Christian saint, or martyr ; in Tacitus it is a majestic and virtuous Roman matron, an Agrippina, in Dante an unreal mysterious Beatrice.

Dante is not merely the religious Poet of Latin or mediæval Christianity ; in him that mediæval Christianity is summed up as it were, and embodied for perpetuity. The Divine Comedy contains in its sublimest form the whole mythology, and at the same time the quintessence, the living substance, the ultimate conclusions of the Scholastic Theology. The whole course

¹ It is a saying attributed to Talleyrand of Tacitus, "Quand on lit cet homme-là on est au Confessional."

of Legend, the Demonology, Angelology, the extra mundane world, which in the popular belief was vague, fragmentary, incoherent, in Dante, as we have seen, becomes an actual, visible, harmonious system. In Dante heathen images, heathen mythology are blended in the same living reality with those of Latin Christianity, but they are real in the sense of the early Christian Fathers. They are acknowledged as part of the vast hostile Demon world, just as the Angelic Orders, which from Jewish or Oriental tradition obtained their first organization in the hierarchy of the Areopagite. So, too, the schools of Theology meet in the Poet. Aquinas, it has been said, has nothing more subtle and metaphysical than the Paradise, only that in Dante single lines, or pregnant stanzas, have the full meaning of pages or chapters of divinity. But though his doctrine is that of Aquinas, Dante has all the fervor and passion of the Mystics ; he is Bonaventura as well as St. Thomas.

Dante was in all respects but one, his Ghibellinism, the religious poet of his age, and to many minds not less religious for that exception. ^{Dante's} ^{Ghibellinism.} He was anti-Papal, but with the fullest reverence for the spiritual supremacy of the successor of St. Peter. To him, as to most religious Imperialists or Ghibellines, to some of the spiritual Franciscans, to a vast host of believers throughout Christendom, the Pope was two distinct personages. One, the temporal, they scrupled not to condemn with the fiercest reprobation, to hate with the bitterest cordiality : Dante damns Pontiffs without fear or remorse. But the other, the Spiritual Pope, was worthy of all awe or reverence ; his sacred person must be inviolate ; his words, if not infallible, must be

heard with the profoundest respect; he is the Vicar of Christ, the representative of God upon earth. With his Ghibelline brethren Dante closed his eyes against the incongruity, the inevitable incongruity, of these two discordant personages meeting in one: the same Boniface is in hell, yet was of such acknowledged sanctity on earth that it was spiritual treason to touch his awful person. The Saints of Dante are the Saints of the Church; on the highest height of wisdom is St. Thomas, on the highest height of holiness, St. Benedict, St. Dominic, St. Francis. To the religious adversaries of the Church he has all the stern remorselessness of an inquisitor. The noble Frederick II., whom we have just heard described as the parent of Italian poetry, the model of a mighty Emperor, the Cæsar of Cæsars, is in hell as an archheretic, as an atheist.¹ In hell, in the same dreary circle, up to his waist in fire, is the noblest of the Ghibellines, Farinata degli Uberti. In hell for the same sin is the father of his dearest friend and brother poet Guido Cavalcanti. Whatever latent sympathy seems to transpire for Fra Dolcino, he is unrelentingly thrust down to the companionship of Mohammed. The Catholic may not reverse the sentence of the Church.

Petrarch, as an Italian poet, excepting in his Ode to the Virgin, stands almost aloof from the mediæval religion; it is only as a Latin poet, and in his familiar Letters, that he inveighs against the vices, the irreligion of the Court of Avignon.

Boccaccio, the third of this acknowledged Triumvirate, was, on the other hand, in his one great work, unquestionably as regards the dominant

¹ Inferno, x. 1119. Piero della Vigna calls him —

“Al mio Signor, che fu d' amor al degno.” — *Inferno*, xiii. 75.

religion of his times, its monkhood and hierarchism, the most irreligious, on account of his gross immoralities, to all ages an irreligious writer. The Decamerone centres in itself all the wit, all the indecency, all the cleverest mockery of the French and Provençal Fabliaux, and this it has clothed in that exquisite, all-admired Florentine which has secured its undying fame. The awful description of the Plague in Florence has been compared, but by no means with justice, to that of Thucydides and that of Lucretius. This grave opening of the Decamerone might be expected to usher in a book of the profoundest devotion, the most severe, ascetic penitential. After this, another Dante might summon the smitten city to behold its retributive doom in the Infernal Regions; a premature Savonarola might thunder his denunciations, and call on Florence, thus manifestly under divine visitation, to cast all her pomps and vanities, her ornaments, her instruments of luxury, upon the funeral pyre; to sit and lament in dust and ashes. This terrific opening leads, but not in bitter irony, to that other common consequence of such dark visitations, the most reckless license. Tale follows tale, gradually sinking from indecency into obscenity, from mockery to utter profaneness. The popular religion, the popular teachers, are exposed with the coarsest, most reckless pleasantry. Erasmus, two centuries later, does not scoff with more playful freedom at pilgrimages, relics, miracles: Voltaire himself, still two centuries after Erasmus, hardly strips their sanctity from monks, nuns and friars, with more unsparing wit. Nothing, however sung or told in satiric verse or prose against the Court of Rome,

can equal the exquisite malice of the story of the Jew converted to Christianity by a visit to Rome, because no religion less than divine could have triumphed over the enormous wickedness of its chief teachers, the Cardinals, and the Pope. Strange age of which the grave Dante and the gay Boccaccio are the representatives! in which the author of the Decamerone is the biographer of Dante, the commentator on the Divine Comedy, expounding, pointing, echoing, as it were, in the streets of Florence the solemn denunciations of the poet. More strange, if possible, the history of the Decamerone. Boccaccio himself bitterly repented of his own work: he solemnly warned the youth of Florence against his own loose and profane novels; the scoffer at fictitious relics became the laborious collector of relics not less doubtful; the scourge of the friars died in the arms of friars, bequeathing to them his manuscripts, hoping only for salvation through their prayers.¹ Yet the disowned and proscribed Decamerone became the text-book of pure Italian. Florence, the capital of letters, insisted on the indefeasible prerogative of the Florentine dialect, and the Decamerone was ruled to be the one example of Florentine. The Church was embar-

¹ See in the works of Petrarch the very curious letter to Boccaccio, de Vaticinio Morientium, Opera, p. 740. Boccaccio had written in a paroxysm of superstitious terror to Petrarch concerning the prophecies of a certain holy man, Peter of Sienna, on the death of the two poets. Petrarch evidently does not believe a word of what had frightened poor Boccaccio. He alleges many causes of suspicion. "Non extenuo vaticinii pondus, quicquid a Christo dicitur verum est. Fieri nequit ut veritas mentiatur. At id quæritur Christianæ rei hujus autor sit, an alter quispiam ad commenti fidem, quod sæpe vidimus, Christi nomen assumpserit." The poet urges Boccaccio, at great length, not to abandon letters, but only the lighter letters of his youth.

passed; in vain the Decamerone was corrected, mutilated, interpolated, and indecencies, profanenesses annulled, erased: all was without effect; the Decamerone must not be degraded from its high and exemplary authority. The purity of morals might suffer, the purity of the language must remain unattainted; till at length an edition was published in which the abbesses and nuns, who were enamored of their gardeners, became profane matrons and damsels; friars, who wrought false miracles, necromancers; adulterous priests, soldiers. But this last bold effort of jesuitical ingenuity was without effect: the Decamerone was too strong for the censure in all its forms; it shook off its fetters, obstinately refused to be altered, as before it had refused to be chastened; and remains to this day at once the cleverest and bitterest satire, and the most curious illustration of the religion of the age.¹

¹ "Finalmente un Dominicano Italiano e di natura più facile (chiamavasi Eustachio Locatelli, e morì vescovo a Reggio) vi s' interpose e per essere stato confessore de Pio V., impetrò di Gregorio XIII. che il Decamerone non fosse mutilato, se non in quanto bisognava il buono nome degli Ecclesiastici." — P. 249. The account of the whole transaction at length may be read in the *Discorso* prefixed to Foscolo's edition of the Decamerone, London, 1825. Compare the fifth and sixth discourse of Foscolo; the most just criticism with which I am acquainted on Boccaccio, his merits, his influence, his style, and his language. I quote Boccaccio's will on Foscolo's authority. There is nothing new under the sun, nothing obsolete. I possess a translation of Eugene Sue's *Wandering Jew*, printed on the coarsest paper, the rudest type, and cheapest form, obviously intended for the lower Roman Catholics, in which the Jesuit becomes a Russian spy; all that is religious is transformed into political satire.

CHAPTER VI.

LANGUAGE OF FRANCE.

NOTHING is more remarkable in the civil or in the religious history of the West, nothing led to more momentous or enduring results, than the secession, as it were, of the great kingdom of France from the Teutonic, and its adhesion to the Latin division of Christendom; the fidelity of its language to its Roman descent, and its repudiation of the German conqueror. For about four centuries, loosely speaking, Gaul, from the days of Julius Cæsar, was a province of the Roman Empire. During that period it became Romanized in manners, institutions, language. The Celtic dialect was driven up into the North-Western corner of the land. If it subsisted, as seems to have been the case in the time of Irenæus, still later in that of Jerome, or in the fifth century,¹ as the dialect of some of the peas-

¹ According to Ulpian in the second century wills might be drawn in Latin or in the language of Gaul, the Celtic therefore had a legal existence. St. Jerome in the fourth century compares the language of the Asiatic Galatians with that which he had heard spoken in the neighborhood of Trèves. In the fifth, Sulpicius Severus desires one of the interlocutors in a dialogue to speak in Gallic or Celtic (*Dialog. i. sub fine*). Sidonius Apollinarius says that the nobles of his province (Auvergne) had only just cast off all the scales of their Celtic speech: this may have been the pronunciation. The father of Ausonius, a physician at Bazas in Aquitaine, spoke Latin imperfectly. Compare Ampère, *Hist. Lit. de la France*, pp. 36 and 136.

antry ; if it left its vestiges in the names of plains, of forests and mountains ; if even some sounds and words found their way into the supervening Latin, and became a feeble constituent of French ; yet there can be no doubt that the great mass of the French language, both the *Langue d'Oil* of the North, and the *Langue d'Oc* of the South, is of Latin origin.¹

For about four centuries, Teutonic tribes, Goths, Burgundians, Alemannians, Franks, ruled in Gaul, from the first inroad and settlement of the Visigoths in the South, down to the third generation after Charlemagne. Clovis and his race, Charlemagne and his immediate descendants, were Teutons ; the language at the Court of Soissons, in the capitals of Neustria and Austrasia, as afterwards in that of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, was German. Nor was it only so in the Court ; there were Germans throughout the Frankish realm of Charlemagne. The Council of Tours enacts that every Bishop should have homilies in both languages ; he should be able to expound them in the rustic Roman and in the Teutonic, so as to be intelligible to the whole people.²

But the grandsons of Charlemagne behold Latin and Teutonic nationality, the Latin and Teutonic language, dividing the Western Empire. The German is withdrawing, if not beyond the Rhine, to

Separation.
A.D. 842.

¹ M. Fauriel (*Histoire de la Poésie Provençale*, i. p. 195) observes of the Provençal that there are more words not of Latin origin than is commonly supposed. He had collected 3000. The whole Provençal literature might perhaps furnish him as many. A great part he could trace to no known language. Some few are Arabic, many Greek, some Celtic, some Basque ; not above fifteen Teutonic. The whole investigation is worthy of study.

² A. D. 812. Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 1263. This injunction was renewed at Rheims and at Mentz A. D. 847. There are fragments of old German sermons. — Raumer, p. 66.

the provinces bordering on the Rhine ; Latin is resuming its full dominion over France and the French language. At Strasburg, only thirty years after the Council of Tours, France has become French, Germany German. The two Kings of the same race, equally near in blood to Charlemagne, take their oaths in languages not only dialectically different, but distinct in root and origin. Germany still recedes, leaving but few traces of its long dominion ; the Celtic element probably contributes more to the French language than the German. In truth the Germans after all were but an armed oligarchy in France, like the Turks in their European provinces, but by no means so inaccessibly shut up in their Oriental habits, in their manners, in their religion. Even in the Visigothic South, no sooner had the conquest passed over, than the native language, or rather the naturalized Latin, reasserted its independence, its jealous and exclusive superiority : and this, although the Goths were routed and driven out by another Teutonic race, the Franks of the North. France returned entirely to its Latinity ; and from its rustic Roman gradually formed that language which was to have such wide influence on later civilization.

In this conservation of France to Latin and Latin Christianity, no doubt Latin Christianity, and the hierarchy so long, even under the German sway, of Latin descent, powerfully contributed. The unity of religion in some degree broke down the barrier between the Teuton and the Roman Gaul ; they worshipped the same God in the same Church ; looked for absolution from their sins, trembled before, or sought humbly the counsel of the same Priest. But the Clergy, as has been seen, remained long almost exclusively Roman. The

Teutons, who aspired to the high places of the Church (for the services remained obstinately Roman), were compelled to possess one qualification, the power of ministering in that Latin service. The most rude, most ignorant, most worldly Bishop or Priest must learn something, and that lesson must be the recitation at least, or pronunciation of Latin. Charlemagne's schools, wherever the Teutonic element was the feeblest, would teach in the Rustic Roman, or the Roman more or less rapidly tending to its new form. At least in the Church and in the Cloister the Latin ruled without rival; among the people the Latin element was far the stronger: the stronger is ever aggressive; and the Teutonic was by degrees renounced, and driven towards the Rhine, or over the Rhine. The German Teuton, mindful of his descent, might still call himself a Frank, but the Gallic Frank had ceased to be a German.¹

It is not the least singular fact in the history of the French language, that another German, or ^{The Nor-} kindred Scandinavian race, wrests a large ^{mans.} province from France. Normandy takes its name from its Norman conquerors: the land, according to Teutonic usage, is partitioned among those adventurers; they are the lords of the soil. In an exceedingly short time the Normans cease to be Teutons; they are

¹ In the epitaph on Gregory V. (997), he is said to have spoken three languages: Frankish (German), the Vulgar (Romance or Italian), and Latin: —

“Usus Franciscæ, vulgari, et voce Latinâ
Instituit populos eloquio triplici.”

Gregory (Bruno, cousin of the Emperor Otho) was a German. — Murator. Diss. ii. 91. At this time in Italy traces of Italian begin to appear in wills and deeds. — Ibid. p. 93.

French or Latin in language. About a century and a half after the establishment of the Normans in France, the descendants of Rollo conquer England, and the Conqueror introduces not a kindred dialect, but the hostile and oppugnant Norman-French, into Anglo-Saxon England. The imposition of this foreign tongue, now the exclusive language of the Normans, is the last and incontestable sign of their complete victory over the native inhabitants. This is not the less extraordinary when the Italian Normans also are found for some time obstinately refusing to become Italians. They endeavor to compel the Italians to adopt their French manners and language; histories of the Norman conquest are written at Naples or within the kingdom, in Norman-French.¹ The dialect has adopted some Italian words, but it is still French.² Thus within France Teutonism absolutely and entirely surrenders its native tongue, and becomes in the North and in the South of Europe a powerful propagator of a language of Latin descent.

It is not the office of this history to trace the obscure growth of the French language out of the preëxisting elements — the primal Celtic and the Latin. It must not be forgotten that higher up the Celtic and the Latin branch off from the same family — the Indo-Teutonic:³

¹ "Moribus et lingua, quoscunque venire videbant,
Informant propria, gens efficiatur ut unum."

— Gul. Appul. Lib. i.; Muratori, v. 255.

² Compare on this subject M. Champollion Figeac's preface to the French Chronicle of the Italian Normans, "Les Normans" (publication of the Société Historique), p. xliv., &c. with the references to Falconet, Lebœuf, Le Grand d'Aussy, and Tiraboschi.

³ This fact in the history of language, first established by our countryman, Dr. Prichard, in his Essay on the Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, is now admitted by all writers of authority. See also the excellent

so that the actual roots of French words may be reasonably deduced from either. The Christian language, all the titles, terms, and words which related to the religion, were doubtless pure Latin, and survived, but slightly modified, in the French. Pronunciation is among the most powerful agents in the change and formation of language, in the silent abrogation of the old, the silent crystallization of the new. Certain races, nations, tribes, families, have a predilection, a predisposition, a facility for the utterance of certain sounds. They prefer labial or guttural, hard or soft letters; they almost invariably substitute the mute, the surd, or the aspirate letter for its equivalent; there is an uniformity, if not a rule of change, either from organism or habit. The Italian delights in the termination of words with a soft vowel, the Langue d'Oc with a consonant, the French with a mute vowel. The Latin of the Ritual being a written language, in its structure as well as in its words would inflex- ^{Effect of Church service.} ibly refuse all change; it would not take the auxiliary verb in place of its conjugations, the article or the preposition to designate its cases; it would adhere to its own declensions, conjugations, inflections, and thus far would stand aloof from the gradual change going on around it; it would become in so far unintelligible to the vulgar ear. But not only, the roots remaining the same, would, the great mass of the words retain their significance; there would also be some approximation in the tone and accent. The Clergy, being chiefly of the country, and in their ordinary conversation using

treatise of M. Pictet, "L'Affinité des Langues Celtiques avec le Sanscrit." Mr. Bruce Whyte was unfortunately not master of this branch of Philology which supersedes at once or modifies his whole system.

the language of the country, would pronounce their Latin with a propensity to the same sounds which were forming the French. Latin as pronounced by an Italian, a Frenchman, or a Spaniard, during the formation, and after the formation, of the new tongue, would have a tinge of Italian, French, or Spanish in its utterance. The music being common throughout the Church might perhaps prevent any wide deviation, but whatever deviation there might be would tend to make the meaning of the words more generally and easily comprehensible. So there would be no precise time when the Latin Ritual would become at once and perceptibly a foreign tongue; the common rustic Roman, or the Romance, if not the offspring was probably akin to the ecclesiastical Latin, at all events all Church words or terms would form part of it. And so on the one hand Latin Christianity would have a powerful influence in the creation of the new language, and at the same time never be an unintelligible stranger, hers would be rather a sacred and ancient form of the same language among her lineal and undoubted descendants.

The early poetry of the Langue d'Oil was either the Legend or the Poem of Chivalry. The Trouvère of the North was far more creative than the Troubadour of the South. In his lighter Fabliaux the Trouvère makes no less free with the Christian Clergy and with Christian morals than his brother of the South, but his is the freedom of gayety or of licentiousness, not of bitter hatred, or pitiless, and contemptuous satire. There is nothing of the savage seriousness of the Provençal.¹

¹ It must not be forgotten that Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante (so little prescient was he of the glory of his pupil), wrote his *Tesoretto* not in Italian but in French, as of all the vernacular tongues the most likely to be enduring.

But the higher Epopee of the Northern Trouvère was almost contemporaneous in its rise with the Crusades ; its flourishing period was that of the Crusades, and as far as that was a real and actual state of society, of Chivalry. It is the heroic poetry of mediæval Christianity. The Franks were the warriors, the Franks the poets of the Cross. In both the great Cycles, of Charlemagne and his Peers, of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, in the subordinate cycles, as of Rinaldo, or the four Sons of Aymon, the hero was ever a Christian knight, the enemy, whether knight, giant, or even dragon, was antichristian, Saracen, misbeliever, or devil. Charlemagne's war is of the West against the East, of Latin Christianity against Islam ; the Gascons and the Basques at Roncesvalles become the splendid Saracens of Spain ; the whole misbelieving East is gathered around Christian Paris. The Church avouched the wonders of Archbishop Turpin, adopted the noble fictions about Charlemagne and his Peers. These became part of authorized Christian Legend, when Legend and History were one ; when it would have been equal impiety to assert the mythic character of the former as that of the authentic Gospel.¹ So, too, whether Arthur and his Knights sprung, as is most probable, from Breton or from British lays, the Saxondom of his foes recedes, the Paganism, even the Saracenism takes its place. It is not the ancient British King and his British warriors warring with Saxons and Anglians on the borders of Wales, Cumberland, or Cornwall for the dominion of Britain ; it is the Christian King and the Christian Knight waging a general war of adventure against unbelievers. It is

¹ Tiraboschi, l. v.

not the independence of Britain, it is the mystic Sangreal, the cup with the blood of the Redeemer, which is the holy object, the ideal reward of their valor; it is to be the triumph of the most chaste and virtuous as well as of the bravest knight. The sons of Aymon are Southern knights keeping the Spanish borders (Spain reserved her Cid for her own noble old poem), but the Sons of Aymon are adopted Northerns; the Troubadour Poetry knows little or nothing of their chivalry. Toulouse owns only her own unidealized, unromanticized Counts: the few Provençal poems of chivalry are of doubtful origin: their Epic is the dull verse chronicle of the Albigensian War.

But, after all, in this inexhaustible fecundity of her Romance, whether from the rudeness and imperfection of the language at this period of her prolific creativeness, or from some internal inaptitude in French for this high class of poetry, from want of vigor, metrical harmony, and variety, or even from its excellence, its analytical clearness and precision, the Mediæval Poetry of Northern France, with all its noble, chivalrous, and crusading impulses, called forth no poet of enduring fame. The Homer of this race of cyclic poets was to be an Italian. It was not till these poems had sunk into popular tales; till, from the poem recited in the castle or the court of the King or the Baron, they had become disseminated among the people;¹ not till they

¹ "Tutte le meraviglie ch' oggi leggiamo nè romanzi o poemi, che hanno per soggetto i Paladini, erano allora raccontate al popolo dai novellatori; e quest' uso rimane in alcune città e specialmente in Venezia e in Napoli sino a quest' ultimi anni. Chiunque non sapeva leggere, si raccoglieva quasi ogni sera d'estate intorno il novellatore su la riva del mare," &c. &c. Foscolo, Discorso, v. p. 229. This accounts at once for the adoption of such subjects by Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto, when the high tide of classical let-

had spread into Italy, and as the "Reali di Francia" had been over and over again recited by the professional story-tellers, and been rudely versified by humbler poets, that they were seized first by the bold and accomplished Boiardo, afterwards by the inimitable Ariosto, and in their full ancient spirit, yet with some fine modern irony, bequeathed to mankind in the most exquisite and harmonious Italian. Even the Crusades were left to the gentle and romantic Tasso, when the religious fire of the Crusades and of Chivalry was all but extinct in its cold faint embers.

But if the Crusades, and by the Crusades Latin Christianity, did not create enduring French poetry, they created the form of history in which France has excelled all Europe. Perhaps of vernacular history, properly so called, the Florentine Villani is the parent; of political history, Dino Compagni; but that history, which delights from its reality and truth, as springing from the personal observation, instinct with the personal character, alive with all the personal feelings of the historian, the model and type of the delightful *Memoir*, is to be found first in Villehardouin and Joinville, to rise to still higher perfection in Froissart and in De Comines. No cold later epic on St. Louis will rival the poetry of Joinville.

They had not passed away; as well as for the unbounded popularity of their poems, and of countless other epics, once common as the stones in the streets, now the rarities of the choicest libraries.

CHAPTER VII.

TEUTONIC LANGUAGES.

IN all the Romance languages, as it has appeared, in all languages of Latin descent, Italian, Teutonic languages. French both in its northern and southern form, Spanish in all its dialects, the religious vocabulary, every word which expressed Christian notions, or described Christian persons, was Latin, only lengthened out or shortened, deflected, or moulded, according to the genius of each tongue; they were the same words with some difference of pronunciation or form, but throughout retaining their primal sense: the words, even if indistinctly understood, had at least an associated significance, they conveyed, if not fully, partially to all, their proper meaning.

In the Teutonic languages it was exactly the reverse. For all the primal and essential Christian notions the German found its own words; it was only what may be called the Church terms, the ecclesiastical functions and titles, which it condescended or was compelled to borrow from the Latin.¹ The highest of all, "God,"

¹ M. Regnier, in a *Mémoire* in the last year's *Transactions of the Academy* (p. 324), has summed up in a few clear French sentences, the substance of a learned work by Rudolf Raumer, which I have read with much profit. "*Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache.*" Berlin, 1851. "Un fait remarquable, et qui prouve bien avec quel soin jaloux la langue se conservait pure de toute mélange étrangère, c'est qu'au

with all its derivatives, the "Godhead, godly, god-like," was in sound entirely remote from "Deus, the deity, the divinity, the divine." As to the attributes of God, the German had his own word for almightiness, for the titles the all-merciful or all-gracious.¹ For the Trinity, indeed, as in all Indo-Teutonic languages, the numerals are so nearly akin, that there would be at least a close assonance, if not identity, in the words; and the primitive word for "father" is so nearly an universal, that the Latin "Pater" might be dimly discerned under the broader Teutonic pronunciation, "Fader." But the "Son and the Holy Ghost"² were pure, unapproaching Teuton. The names of the Saviour, "Jesus," and "the Christ," passed of course into the creed and ritual; but the "Lord," and the German "Herr," were Teuton, as were the "healer, health," for the "Saviour and salvation," the "atonement" for the "propitiation."³ In the older versions the now ignoble words "hanging and the gallows" were used instead of the Crucifixion and the Cross: the "Resurrection" takes the German form.⁴ The "Angels and the Devils" underwent but little change; but all the special terms of the Gospel, "the

moment même de l'introduction du Christianisme, qui apportait tant d'idées nouvelles, elle n'eut pas besoin d'emprunter au Grec et au Latin les mots qui les rendaient, que ses propres ressources lui suffirent en grande partie, surtout pour l'expression des sentiments qui appartenaient à la foi Chrétienne, et que ce ne fut guère que pour l'organisation extérieure de l'Eglise, qu'elle reçut en partie du dehors les mots avec les faits." — In a note M. Regnier illustrates these assertions by examples, many of them the same as those cited in my text.

¹ Compounds from Macht — Barmherzigkeit — Gnade.

² Der Sohn, der Heilige Geist.

³ Der Herr, Heiland, Heil.

⁴ Notker and Otfrid use "hengan und galgen." — Auferstehung, Rodolf Baumer, b. iii

soul, sin, holiness, faith, prayer, repentance, penance, confession, conversion, heaven and hell, Doomsday, even Baptism and the Lord's Supper," were new and peculiar.¹ The Book;² the Seer not the Prophet;³ above all, the great Festivals of Christmas and Easter,⁴ were original, without relation in sound or in letters to the Latin. Of the terms which discriminated the Christian from the Unbeliever one was different; the Christian, of course, was of all languages, the Gentile or the Pagan became a "heathen." So too "the world" took another name. To the German, instructed through these religious words, the analogous vocabulary of the Latin service was utterly dead and without meaning; the Latin Gospel was a sealed book, the Latin service a succession of unintelligible sounds. The offices and titles of the Clergy alone, at least of the Bishop and the Deacon, as well as the Monk, the Abbot, the Prior, the Cloister, were transferred and received as honored strangers in the land, in which the office was as new as the name.⁵ "The Martyr" was unknown but to Christianity, therefore the name lived

¹ Seele, Sünde, Schuld, Heiligkeit, Glaube, Gebete, Reue, Busse, Beichte, Bekehrung, Himmel, Hölle, Taufe, Heiliges Abendmahl.

² Rodolf Raumer, b. iii.

³ Ulphilas used the word *praufetus*. See Zahn's glossary to his edition of Ulphilas, p. 70. The German word is *Seher*, or *Wahrsager*.

⁴ *Weihnacht*. *Ostara* (in Anglo-Saxon, Easter) parait avoir désigné dans des temps plus anciens une Déesse Germanique dont la fête se célébrait vers la même époque que notre Fête de Pâques, et qui avait donné son nom au mois d'Avril. — Grimm, *Mythologie*, p. 267, 8vo., 2e edit., &c. &c. M. Regnier might have added to his authorities that of Bede, who in his *de Comp. Temporum* gives this derivation *Pfingsten* is *Pentecost*.

⁵ *Pfaffe*, the more common word for *Clericus*, is from *Papa*. — Raumer, p. 295. It is curious that in the oldest translators the High Priests, *Annas* and *Caiaphas*, are Bishops. — *Ibid.* 297.

"The Church" the Teuton derived, perhaps through the Gothic of Ulphilas, from the Greek ;¹ but besides this single word there is no sign of Greek more than of Latin in the general Teutonic Christian language.² The Bible of Ulphilas was that of an ancient race, which passed away with that race ; it does not appear to have been known to the Germans east of the Rhine, or to the great body of the Teutons, who were converted to Christianity some centuries later, from the seventh to the eleventh. The Germans who crossed the Rhine or the Alps came within the magic circle of the Latin ; they submitted to a Latin Priesthood ; they yielded up their primitive Teuton, content with forcing many of their own words, which were of absolute necessity, perhaps some of their inflections, into the language which they ungraciously adopted. The descendants of the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, the Lombards, by degrees spoke languages of which the Latin was the groundwork ; they became in every sense Latin Christians.

Our Anglo-Saxon ancestors were the first Teutonic race which remained Teuton. It is a curious ^{Anglo-Saxon.} problem how the Roman Missionaries from the South, and the Celtic Missionaries from the North, wrought the conversion of Anglo-Saxondom.³ Probably the early conversions in most parts of the island were hardly more than ceremonial ; the substitution of one rite for another ; the deposing one God and accepting another, of which they knew not much more

¹ Walafrid Strabo gives this derivation from the Greek through the Gothic. The word is, I believe, not found in the extant part of Ulphilas.

² Even the word "Catholic" is superseded by "Allgemeine."

³ Augustine addressed Ethelbert through an interpreter. The Queen and her retinue were French, and used to intercourse with a Latin priesthood.

than the name; and the subjection to one Priesthood, who seemed to have more powerful influence in heaven, instead of another who had ceased to command success in war, or other blessings which they expected at his hands. This appears from the ease and carelessness with which the religion was for some period accepted and thrown off again. As in the island, or in each separate kingdom, the Christian or the Heathen King, the Christian or the Heathen party was the stronger, so Christianity rose and fell. It was not till the rise of a Priesthood of Anglo-Saxon birth under Wilfrid, or during his time, that England received true Christian instruction; it was not till it had, if not an Anglo-Saxon ritual, Anglo-Saxon hymns, legends, poetry, sermons, that it can be properly called Christian; and all those in their religious vocabulary are Teutonic, not Latin. It was in truth notorious that, even among the Priesthood, Latin had nearly died out, at least if not the traditional skill of repeating its words, the knowledge of its meaning.

Our Anglo-Saxon Fathers were the first successful missionaries in Trans-Rhenane Germany. The Celt Columban and St. Gall were hermits and cœnobites, not missionaries; and with their Celtic may have communicated, if they encountered them, with the aboriginal Gauls, but they must chiefly have made their way through Latin. They settled within the pale of Roman Gaul, built their monasteries on the sites of old Roman cities; their proselytes (for they made monks at least, if not numerous converts to the faith) were Gallo-Romans.¹ But no doubt the Anglo-Saxon of

¹ Columban has left a few lines of Latin poetry. While his Celticism appears from his obstinate adherence to the ancient British usage about

Winfred (Boniface) and his brother apostles of Germany was the means of intercourse; the kindred language enabled them to communicate freely and successfully with the un-Romanized races: Teutons were the apostles of Teutons. It was through the persuasive accents of a tongue, in its sounds as in its words closely resembling their own, not in the commanding tones of foreign Latin, that the religion found its way to their hearts and minds. Charlemagne's conversions in the farther north were at first through an instrument in barbarous ages universally understood, the sword. Charlemagne was a Teuton warring on Teutons: he would need no interpreter for the brief message of his evangelic creed to the Saxons — "Baptism or death." Their conversion was but the sign of submission, shaken off constantly during the long wars, and renewed on every successful inroad of the conqueror. But no doubt in the bishoprics and the monasteries, the religious colonies with which Charlemagne really achieved the Christianization of a large part of Germany, though the services might be in Latin, the schools might instruct in Latin, and the cloister language be Latin, German youths educated as Clergy or as Monks could not forget or entirely abandon their mother-tongue.¹

Easter, it is strange that he should be mixed up with the controversy about the "three Chapters." M. Ampère has pointed out the singular contrast between the adulation of Columban's letter to Pope Boniface on this subject, "*pulcherrimo omnium totius Europæ ecclesiarum capiti . . . Papæ prædicto, præcelso, præsentī (præstanti?) pastorum pastori . . . humillimus celsissimo, agrestis urbano,*" and the bold and definite language of the letter itself: "*Jamdiu enim potestas apud vos erit, quamdiu recta ratio permanserit. Dolere se de infamiâ quæ cathedræ S. Petri inuritur.*" — *Annal. Benedict.* i. 274. Compare Ampère, *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iii. p. 9. The Celt is a Latin in language rather than in thought.

¹ Dem Kloster S. Gallen wird im 10ten Jahrhundert nachgerühmt, dass nur die kleinsten Knaben seiner Schule sich der deutschen Sprache be-

Latin and German became insensibly mingled, and interpenetrated each other. As to the general language of the country, there was an absolute necessity that the strangers should yield to the dominant Teutonism, rather than, like Rome of old in her conquered provinces, impose their language on the subject people. The Empire of Charlemagne till his death maintained its unity. The great division began to prevail during the reign of Louis the Pious, between the German and the Frank portions of the Empire. By that time the Franks (though German was still spoken in the north-east, between the Rhine and the Meuse) had become blended and assimilated with those who at least had begun to speak the *Langue d'Oil* and the *Langue d'Oc*.¹ But before the oath at Strasburg had as it were pronounced the divorce between the two realms, Teutonic preachers had addressed German homilies to the people, parts of the Scripture had found their way into Germany, German vernacular poets had begun to familiarize the Gospel history to the German ear, the Monks aspired to be vernacular poets.² As in Anglo-Saxon England, so in the dominions of Louis the Pious,

dienten; alle übrigen aber mussten ihre Conversation Lateinisch führen. In den meisten Fällen aber lief natürlich der Gebrauch der deutschen Muttersprache neben dem der Lateinischen her. Daher entstand jene Mischung Lateinischer mit deutschen Worten, die wir in so vielen Glossenhandschriften der Althochdeutschen Zeit finden. Man erklärte bei der Auslegung Lateinischer Texte die schwierigeren Wörter entweder durch geläufigere Lateinische oder auch durch entsprechende Deutsche. Dadurch musste eine fortdauernde Wechselwirkung zwischen dem Lateinischen und Deutschen in den Klöstern entstehen. — Raumer, p. 201. Otfried, the German sacred poet, owed his education to the scholar and theologian, H. Rhabanus Maurus.

¹ See above, from the canons of the Councils of Tours, Rheims, and Mentz.

² See on the Vienna fragments of the old German translation of St. Matthew, and the version of the Gospel Harmony of Ammianus, Notker's Psalms, the Lord's Prayer, and Creed. — Raumer, pp. 35 *et seq.*

and of Lothaire, the Heliand, and the Harmony of the Gospels by Otfried, had opened the Bible, at least the New Testament, to the popular ear. The Heliand was written in the dialect of Lower Saxony. Otfried, a Monk of Weissenberg in Alsace, wrote in High German. The Heliand is alliterative verse, Otfried in rhyme. Otfried wrote his holy poem to wean the minds of men from their worldly songs; the history of the Redeemer was to supplant the songs of the old German heroes. How far Otfried succeeded in his pious design is not known, but even in the ninth century other Christian poetry, a poem on St. Peter, a legend of St. Gall, a poem on the miracles of the Holy Land, introduced Christian thoughts and Christian imagery into the hearts of the people.¹

Thus Christianity began to speak to mankind in Greek; it had spoken for centuries in the commanding Latin; henceforth it was to address a large part of the world in Teutonic. France and Spain were Roman-

¹ On the Heliand and on Otfried see the powerful criticism of Gervinus, *Geschichte der Poetischen National Literatur der Deutschen*, i. p. 84, *et seq.* Neither are translators; they are rather paraphrasts of the Gospel. The Saxon has more of the popular poet, Otfried more of the religious teacher; in Otfried the poet appears, in the Saxon he is lost in his poetry. Where the Saxon leaves the text of the Gospel, it is in places where the popular poetry offers him matter and expression for epic amplification or adornment, as in the Murder of the Innocents; and where in the description of the Last Judgment he reminds us of the Scandinavian imagery of the destruction of the world: in this not altogether unlike the fragment of the *Muspeli* edited by Schmeller. Instead of this, Otfried cites passages of the Prophets Joel and Zephaniah. On the whole, the Saxon has an epic, Otfried a lyric and didactic character. Gervinus thinks but meanly of Otfried as a poet. The whole passage is striking and instructive. The Heliand has been edited by Schmeller; and Otfried best by Graff, Königsberg, 1831. Compare Lachman's article in *Ersch und Grüber's Encyclopädie*. The Poem on St. Gall exists only in a fragment of a Latin translation in Pertz, ii. p. 33. The first is in Hoffman, *Geschichte des Deutschen Kirchlides*; the last in Vit. Altman. in *Pez. Script. Rer. Austriac.* i. p. 117.

ized as well as Christianized. Germany was Christianized, but never Romanized. England, Germanized by the Anglo-Saxon conquest, was partially Romanized again by the Normans, who, in their province of France, had entirely yielded to the Gallo-Roman element. Westward of the Rhine and south of the Danube, the German conquerors were but a few, an armed aristocracy; in Germany they were the mass of the people. However, therefore, Roman religion, to a certain extent Roman law, ruled eastward of the Rhine, each was a domiciled stranger. The Teuton in character, in habits, in language, remained a Teuton. As their tribes of old united for conquest; the conquest achieved, severed again to erect independent kingdoms; as the Roman Empire in Germany was at last but a half-naturalized fiction, controlled, limited, fettered by the independent Kings, Princes, and Prelates: so, as our History has shown, there was a constant struggle in the German Churchman between the Churchman and the Teuton — a gravitating tendency towards Roman unity in the Churchman, a repulsion towards independence in the Teuton. But for the Imperial claims on Italy and on Rome, which came in aid of the ecclesiastical centralization under the Papacy, Teutonism might perhaps have much earlier burst free from the Latin unity.

The Norman conquest brought England back into the Roman pale; it warred as sternly against the independence of the Anglo-Saxon Bishop as against that of the Anglo-Saxon thane; it introduced the Latin religious phraseology. Hence in England we in many cases retain and use almost indifferently both the Latin and the Teutonic terms; in some instances only we in-

flexibly adhere to our vernacular religious language, and show a loyal predilection for the Saxon tongue. "God" and "the Lord" retain their uninvaded majesty. "The Son" admits no rival, but we admit the Holy *Spirit* as well as the Holy *Ghost*, but the Holy Ghost "sanctifies." The attributes of God, except his Almightyness and his wisdom, are more often used in theological discussion than in popular speech. Therefore his "omnipresence," his "omniscience" (he is also "all-knowing"), his "ubiquity," his "infinity," his "incomprehensibility," are Latin. In the titles of Christ, "the Saviour," the "Redeemer," the "Intercessor," except in the "Atonement," instead of the "Propitiation or Reconciliation," Latin has obtained the mastery. "Sin" is Saxon; "righteousness" a kind of common property; "mercy and love" may contend for preëminence; "goodness" is genuine German; "faith and charity" are Latin; "love," German. We await "Doomsday, or the Day of Judgment;" but "Heaven and Hell" are pure Teutonisms.¹ "Baptism" is Latinized Greek. The "Lord's Supper" contests with the "Eucharist;" the "Holy Communion" mingles the two. "Easter" is our Paschal Feast. We speak of Gentiles and Pagans, as well as "Heathens." Our inherited Greek, "Church," retains its place; as does "priest," from the Greek presbyter. In common with all Teutons, our ecclesiastical titles, with this exception, are borrowed.

During this period of suspended Teutonic life in England, Germany had not yet receded into her rigid Teutonism. The Crusades united Christendom, Latin

¹ The German Heiden is clearly analogous in its meaning to Pagan; the word is not the Greek Ethnic.

and German, in unresisting and spontaneous confederacy. The Franks, as has been seen, were in the van; Germany followed sluggishly, reluctantly, at intervals, made at least two great paroxysmal efforts under the Emperors, who themselves headed the armaments, but then collapsed into something bordering on apathy. From that time only single Princes and Prelates girt themselves with the Cross. The long feud, the open war of the Emperors and the Popes, was no strife between the races; the Emperor warred not for German interests, but for his own; it was as King of the Romans, with undefined rights over the Lombard and Tuscan cities, later as King of Naples as well as Emperor of Germany, that he maintained the internecine strife. If Frederick II. had been a German, not a Sicilian; if his capital had been Cologne or Mentz or Augsburg, not Palermo or Naples; if his courtly language, the language of his statesmen and poets, had been a noble German, rising above the clashing and confused dialects of High and Low, Franconian, Swabian, Bavarian; if he had possessed the power and the will to legislate for Germany as he legislated for Apulia, different might have been the issue of the conflict.

Throughout all this period, the true mediæval period, Germany was as mediæval as the rest of Christendom. Her poets were as fertile in chivalrous romances; whether translated or founded on those of the Trouvères, there is not a poem on any of the great cycles, the classical or that from ancient history, those of Charlemagne or of Arthur, not a tale of adventure, which has not its antitype in German verse, in one or other of the predominant dialects. The legends of the Saints of all classes and countries (the romances of

religious adventure) are drawn out with the same inexhaustible fecundity, to the same interminable length.¹ The somewhat later Minnesingers echo the amatory songs of the Troubadours; and everywhere, as in France and England, the vernacular first mingles in grotesque incongruity with the Latin Mystery; scenes of less dignity, sometimes broadly comic in the vulgar tongue, are interpolated into the more solemn and stately Latin spectacle.

When the Norman dynasty, and with the Norman dynasty the dominance of the Norman language came to an end, nearly at the same period the English constitution and the English language began to develop themselves in their mingled character, but with Teutonism resuming its superiority. As in the constitution the Anglo-Saxon common law, so in the structure and vocabulary of the language the Anglo-Saxon was the broad groundwork. Poetry rose with the language; and it is singular to observe that the earliest English poems of original force and fancy (we had before only the dry dull histories of Wace, and Robert of Gloucester, Norman rather than English²), the Vision and the Creed of Piers Ploughman, while they borrow their allegorical images from the school of the Romance of the Rose, adopt the alliterative verse of the old Anglo-Saxon. The Romance of the Rose by its extraordi-

¹ Many of these poems, sacred and profane, of enormous length, Titural, the Kaiser Chronik, Kutrun, as well as the great "Passional" and the "Marienleben," are in course of publication at Quedlinburg, in the Bibliothek der Deutschen National Literatur.

² The Ormulum, excellently edited by Dr. Meadows White, Oxford, 1852, is a paraphrase of the Gospels (it is curious to compare it with the older Teutonic Heliand and Otfried) in verse and language, of a kind of transition period, by some called semi-Saxon. See on the Ormulum, Introduction to Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.

nary popularity had introduced the Impersonated Virtues and Vices, which had almost driven out the knights and the saints of the Romance and the Legend; instead of the wild tale of chivalrous adventure, or the holy martyrdom, poetry became a long and weary allegory: even the Mystery before long gave place to the Morality. In some degree this may have been the Morals of Christianity reasserting coequal dignity and importance against ritual observances and blind sacerdotal authority: it is constantly rebuking with grave solemnity, or keen satire, the vices of the Clergy, the Monks, and the Friars.

Before Chaucer, even before Wycliffe, appeared with his rude satire, his uncouth alliterative verse, his homely sense, and independence of thought, the author of *Piers Ploughman's Vision*.¹ This extraordinary manifestation of the religion, of the language, of the social and political notions, of the English character, of the condition, of the passions and feelings of rural and provincial England, commences, and with Chaucer and Wycliffe completes the revelation of this transition period, the reign of Edward III. Throughout its institutions, language, religious sentiment, Teutonism is now holding its first initiatory struggle with Latin Christianity. In Chaucer is heard a voice from the court, from the castle, from the city, from universal England. All orders of society live in his verse, with the truth and originality of individual being, yet each a type of every rank, class, every religious and social condition and pursuit. And there can be no doubt that his is a

¹ The Vision bears its date about 1365. Chaucer's great work is about twenty years later. Wycliffe was hardly known, but by his tract on the Last Days, before 1370. Whitaker, p. xxxvi. and last note to Introduction. Also Wright's Preface.

voice of freedom, of more or less covert hostility to the hierarchical system, though more playful and with a poet's genial appreciation of all which was true, healthful, and beautiful in the old faith. In Wycliffe is heard a voice from the University, from the seat of theology and scholastic philosophy, from the centre and stronghold of the hierarchy; a voice of revolt and defiance, taken up and echoed in the pulpit throughout the land against the sacerdotal domination. In the Vision of Piers Ploughman is heard a voice from the wild Malvern Hills, the voice it should seem of an humble parson, or secular priest. He has passed some years in London, but his home, his heart is among the poor rural population of central Mercian England. Tradition, uncertain tradition, has assigned a name to the Poet, Robert Langland, born at Cleobury Mortimer, in Shropshire, and of Oriel College, Oxford. Whoever he was, he wrote in his provincial idiom, in a rhythm perhaps from the Anglo-Saxon times familiar to the popular ear; if it strengthened and deepened that feeling, no doubt the poem was the expression of a strong and wide-spread feeling. It is popular in a broader and lower sense than the mass of vernacular poetry in Germany and England. We must rapidly survey the religion, the politics, the poetry of the Ploughman.

The Visionary is no disciple, no precursor of Wycliffe in his broader religious views: the Loller of Piers Ploughman is no Lollard; he applies the name as a term of reproach for a lazy indolent vagrant.¹ The Poet is no dreamy speculative theologian; he acquiesces seemingly with unquestioning faith in the creed

¹ *Passus Sextus*, p. 75 and elsewhere, Loller's life is begging at buttry atches, and loitering on Fridays or Feast Days at Church, p. 76.

and in the usages of the Church. He is not profane but reverent as to the Virgin and the Saints. Pilgrimages, penances, oblations on the altar, absolution, he does not reject, though they are all nought in comparison with holiness and charity; on Transubstantiation and the Real Presence and the Sacraments he is almost silent, but his silence is that of submission not of doubt.¹ It is in his intense absorbing moral feeling that he is beyond his age: with him outward observances are but hollow shows, mockeries, hypocrisies without the inward power of religion. It is not so much in his keen cutting satire on all matters of the Church as his solemn installation of Reason and Conscience as the guides of the self-directed soul, that he is breaking the yoke of sacerdotal domination: in his constant appeal to the plainest, simplest Scriptural truths, as in themselves the whole of religion, he is a stern reformer. The sad serious Satirist, in his contemplation of the world around him, the wealth of the world and the woe,² sees no hope, no consolation but in a new order of things, in which if the hierarchy shall subsist, it shall subsist in a form, with powers, in a spirit totally

¹ There is a very curious passage as to the questions even then agitated:—

“I have Heard High men, — eating at the table,
Carp as though they Clerks were, — of Christ and his might,
And laid Faults on the Father — that Formed us all . . .
Why would our Saviour Suffer, — Such a worm in his bliss
That beguiled the woman, — and the man after.”

Wright, 179.

The religious poet puts down these questions with holy indignation.

I quote mostly from Dr. Whitaker's edition, sometimes from Wright's, taking the liberty of modernizing only the spelling, which shows how near most of it is to our vernacular English.

² “And Marvellously me Met — as I May you tell,
All the Wealth of the World — and the Woe both.” — p. 2.

opposite to that which now rules mankind. The mysterious Piers the Ploughman seems to designate from what quarter that reformer is to arise. Piers the Ploughman, who at one time was a sort of impersonation of the industrious and at the same time profoundly religious man, becomes at the close Piers Pardon Ploughman, the great publisher of the pardon of mankind through Christ. In him is the teaching, absolving power of the Church; he is the great assertor and conservator of Unity.

With Wycliffe, with the spiritual Franciscans, Langland ascribes all the evils, social and religious, of the dreary world to the wealth of the Clergy, of the Monks, and the still more incongruous wealth of the Mendicants. With them he asserts the right, the duty, the obligation of the temporal Sovereign to despoil the hierarchy of their corrupting and fatal riches.¹ As he has nothing of the scholastic subtilty, of the Predestinarianism, or speculative freedom of Wycliffe, so he has nothing of the wild spiritualist belief in the prophecies of ages to come. With the Fraticelli, to him the fatal gift of Constantine was the doom of true religion; with them he almost adores poverty, but it is industrious down-trodden rustic poverty; not that of the impostor beggar,² common in his days, and denounced

1 "For if Possession be Poison — and imPerfect these make
The Heads of Holy Church,
It were Charity to disCharge them for Holy Church sake,
And Purge them of the old Poison." — p. 298.

See the whole passage.

² See Passus iv. where Waster refuses to Work, and Piers summons Want to seize him by the paunch, and wring him well. The whole contrast of the industrious and idle poor is remarkable. Also the Impostors and Jolly Beggars, as of our own days, and the favorable view of "God's Minstrels." — Whitaker, p. 154. This passage was not in Mr. Wright's copy.

as sternly as by the political economy of our own, still less of the religious mendicant. Both these are fiercely excluded from his all-embracing charity.¹

Langland is Antipapal, yet he can admire an ideal Pope, a general pacificator, reconciling the Sovereigns of the world to universal amity.² It is the actual Pope, the Pope of Avignon or of Rome, levying the wealth of the world to slay mankind, who is the object of his bitter invective.³ The Cardinals he denounces with the same indignant scorn; but chiefly the Cardinal Legate, whom he has seen in England riding in his pride and pomp, with lewdness, rapacity, merciless extortion, insolence in his train.⁴ Above all, his hatred (it might seem that on this all honest English indignation was agreed) is against the Mendicant orders. Of the older monks there is almost total silence. For St. Benedict, for St. Dominic, for St. Francis he has the profoundest reverence.⁵ But it is against their degenerate sons that he arrays his allegorical Host; the Friars fur-

¹ Pass. vi. p. 76.

² "Sithen Prayed to the Pope, — have Pity of Holy Church,
And no Grace to Grant — till Good love were,
Among all Kind of Kings — over Christian people,
Command all Confessors that any King shrive
Enjoin him Peace for his Penance — and Perpetual forgiveness." — p. 85.

³ Simon and Civil go to Rome to put themselves under the Pope's protection. — P. iii. p. 36.

"And God amend the Pope — that Pilleth Holy Church,
And Claimeth by force to be King — to be Keeper over Christendom,
And Counteth not how Christian Men be Killed and robbed,
And Findeth Folk to Fight, — and Christian blood to spill."

Do Best, p. 1, p. 299.

Compare p. 297.

⁴ "The Country is the Cursedder, — that Cardinals Come in,
And where they Lie and Linger, — Lechery there reigneth "

Wright, p. 420.

⁵ Pass. v. p. 70.

nish every impersonated vice, are foes to every virtue; his bitterest satire, his keenest irony (and these weapons he wields with wonderful poetic force) are against their dissoluteness, their idleness, their pride, their rapacity, their arts, their lies, their hypocrisy, their intrusion into the functions of the Clergy, their delicate attire, their dainty feasts, their magnificent buildings,¹ even their proud learning; above all their hardness, their pitilessness to the poor, their utter want of charity, which with Langland is the virtue of virtues.

Against the Clergy he is hardly less severe;² he sternly condemns their dastardly desertion of their flocks, when during the great plague they crowded to London to live an idle life: that idle life he describes with singular spirit and zest. Yet he seems to recognize the Priesthood as of Divine institution. Against the whole host of officials, pardoners, summoners, Archdeacons, and their functionaries; against lawyers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, he is everywhere fiercely and contemptuously criminatory.

His political views are remarkable.³ He has a notion

¹ He scoffs at those who wish their names to appear in the rich painted windows of the Franciscan churches. The Friar absolves Mede (Bribery)—

“ And sithen he seyde,
We have a window in werkynge.
Woldest thou glaze that gable,
And grave there thy name,
Nigher should thy soul be
Heaven to have.” — Wright, p. 46.

There is a full account in “the Creed” of a spacious and splendid dominican Convent, very curious. “The Creed” is of a later date, by another author, an avowed Lollard.

² He declares that the Clergy shall fall as the Templars had fallen. — Do Bet, i. p. 297. But compare Wright, i. p. 233.

³ There is a strange cross of aristocratical feeling in Langland's levelling actions. That slaves and bastards should be advanced to be clergymen is a

of a king ruling in the affections of the people, with Reason for his chancellor, Conscience for his justiciary. On such a King the commonalty would cheerfully and amply bestow sufficient revenue for all the dignity of his office, and the exigencies of the state, even for his conquests. No doubt that Commonalty would first have absorbed the wealth of the hierarchy.¹ He is not absolutely superior to that hatred of the French, nor even to the ambition for the conquest of France engendered by Edward's wars and by his victories. And yet his shrewd common-sense cannot but see the injustice and cruelty of those aggressive and sanguinary wars.²

As a Poet Langland has many high qualities. He is creating his own language, and that, in a rude and remote province: its groundwork is Saxon-English, exclusively so in most of its words and in its idioms. It admits occasionally French words, but they appear like strangers; his Latinisms, and words of Latin de-

criing grievance. They should be sons of franklins and freemen, if not of Lords:

"And such Bondsmens Bairns have Been made Bishops,
And Barons Bastards have Been Archdeacons,
And Soapers (soap-boilers) and their Sons for Silver have been Knights,
And Lords sons their Labourers."

The Barons mortgaged their estates to go to the wars. They were bought, this is curious, by traders.

¹ What the Commons require of the King is Law, Love, and Truth, and himself for their Lord antecedent (p. 57):

"And I dare Lay my Life that Love would Lend that silver
To Wage (to pay the wages of) them, and help Win that thou Wittest after,
More than all the Merchants, or than the Mitred Bishops,
Or Lombards of Lucca, that Live by Love as Jews." — p. 74.

² Had Mede been Seneschal in France, K. Edward would have conquered the length and breadth of the land. — Pass. iv. p. 51. In another passage, he had won France by gentleness. — Do Wel, p. 250.

scent, might seem drawn directly from the Vulgate Scriptures and the Church services. These he constantly cites in the original Latin. With his Anglo-Saxon alliteration there is a cadence or rhythm in his verse; while Chaucer is writing in rhyme Langland seems utterly ignorant of that poetic artifice. The whole poem is an allegory, by no means without plan, but that plan obscure, broken, and confused; I am inclined to think wanting its close. The Allegory is all his own. The universal outburst of Allegory at this time in Paris, in Germany, in England is remarkable. It had full vogue in Paris, in Rutebeuf, and in the Romance of the Rose, which Chaucer translated into English. As the chivalrous romance and the fabliaux had yielded to the allegorical poem, so also the drama. It might seem, as we have said, as if the awakening moral sense of men, weary of the saints, and angels, and devils, delighted in those impersonations of the unchristian vices and Christian virtues. That which to us is languid, wearisome, unreal, seized most powerfully on the imagination of all orders. Nor had allegory fulfilled its office in the imaginative realm of letters till it had called forth Spenser and Bunyan. Langland, I am disposed to think, approaches much nearer to Bunyan than the Romance of the Rose to the Fairy Queen. But Langland, with all his boldness, and clearness, and originality, had too much which was temporary, much which could not but become obsolete. Bunyan's vision was more simple, had more, if it may be so said, of the moral, or of the scheme, of perpetual, universal Christianity. But Spenser himself has hardly surpassed some few touches by which Langland has designated his personages;

and there is at times a keen quiet irony too fine for Bunyan.

The Poem is manifestly in two parts: the poet, asleep on the Malvern Hills, beholds the whole world; eastward a magnificent tower, the dwelling of Truth; opposite a deep dale, the abode of unblessed spirits; between them a wide plain, in which mankind are following all their avocations. He dwells rapidly on the evils and abuses of all Orders. A stately lady, in white raiment (Holy Church) offers herself as guide to the Castle of Truth, in which is seated the Blessed Trinity. The first five passages of the first part are on the redress of civil wrongs, the last on the correction of religious abuses. Mede (Bribery) with all her crew are on one side; Conscience, who refuses to be wedded to Mede,¹ with Reason on the other. It closes with the King's appointment of Conscience as his Justiciary, of Reason as his Chancellor. In the Sixth Passage the Dreamer awakes; he encounters Reason. As Reason with Conscience is the great antagonist of social and political evil, so again, Reason, vested as a Pope, with Conscience as his Cross Bearer, is alone to

¹ Conscience objects to Mede that she is false and faithless, misleading men by her treasure, leading wives and widows to wantonness. Falsehood and she undid the King's Father (Edward II.), poisoned Popes, impaired Holy Church; she is a strumpet to the basest Sizours of the common law, summoners of the civil law prize her highly, sheriffs of counties would be undcre without her, for she causes men to forfeit lands and lives; she bribes gaolers to let out prisoners, imprisons true men, hangs the innocent. She cares not for being excommunicated in the Consistory Court; she buys absolution by a cope to the Commissary. She can do almost as much work as the King's Privy Seal in 120 days. She is intimate with the Pope, as provisors show. She and Simony seal his Bulls. She consecrates Bishops without learning. She presents Rectors to prebends, maintains priests in keeping concubines and begetting bastards contrary to the Canon, &c. &c. —P. iii. p. 40.

subdue religious evil. For that evil God is visiting the earth with awful pestilences and storms. To avert God's wrath the domestic duties must be observed with fervent affection; the Pope must have pity on the Church, the religious Orders keep to their rule, those who go on pilgrimages to the Saints seek rather Truth. Truth is the one eternal object of man. After Repentance has brought all the seven deadly sins to confession¹ (a strange powerful passage), Hope blows a trumpet, whose blast is to compel mankind to seek Grace from Christ to find out Truth. But no pilgrim who has wandered over the world can show the way to Truth. Now suddenly arises Piers Ploughman; he has long known Truth; he has been her faithful follower. Meekness and the Ten Commandments are the way to, Grace is the Portress of the noble Castle of, Truth. After some time Truth reveals herself. She commands Piers to stay at home, to tend his plough; of the young peasantry industry in their calling is their highest duty; to the laborious poor is offered plenary pardon, and to those who protect them, Kings who rule in righteousness, holy Bishops who justly maintain Church discipline. Less plenary pardon is bestowed on less perfect men, merchants, lawyers who plead for hire. What is this pardon? it is read

¹ The confession of covetousness is admirable: —

“Didst thou ever make restitution?

Yes, I once Robbed some Chapmen, and Rifled their trunks.”

Covetousness would go hang herself—but even for her Repentance has comfort: —

“Have Mercy in thy Mind — and with thy Mouth beseech it,
For Goddes Mercy is More — than all his other works,
And all the Wickedness of the World — that man might Work or think
Is no More to the Mercy of God — than in the Sea a glede (a spark of fire).”

Wright, p. 94.

by a Priest; it contains but these words: "They that have done good shall go into life eternal, they that have done evil into everlasting fire."¹

Thus with *Piers Ploughman*, a holy Christian life, a life of love, of charity, of charity especially to the poor, is all in all; on the attainment of that life dwells the second Vision, the latter part of the poem. There are three personages by the plain names of Do Well, Do Bet (do better), and Do Best. The whole of this ascent through the different degrees of the Christian life is described with wonderful felicity; every power, attribute, faculty of man, every virtue, every vice is impersonated with the utmost life and truth. The result of the whole is that the essence of the Christian life, the final end of Do Well, is charity. Do Bet appears to have a higher office, to teach other men; and this part closes with a splendid description of the Redeemer's life and passion, and that which displays the poetic power of Robert Langland higher perhaps than any other passage, that mysterious part of the Saviour's function between his passion and resurrection commonly called the "harrowing of hell," the deliverance of the spirits in prison.² In Do Best *Piers Ploughman* ap-

¹ It is added —

" For wise men ben holden
To Purchase you Pardon and the Popes bulles,
At the Dreadful Doom when the Dead shall arise,
And Come all before Christ, acCounts to yield
How thou Leddest thy Life here, and his Laws kept. • • • •
A Pouch full of Pardons there, nor Provincials Letters,
Though ye be Found in the Fraternity of all the Four Orders,
And have InDulgences Double fold, if Do Wei you help
I set your Patents and your Pardons at one Pisa worth."

Wright, l. p. 150.

² It is odd that Mahamet (Mahomet) defends the realm of Lucifer against the Lord with guns and mangonels — a whimsical anticipation of Milton.

pears as a kind of impersonation of the Saviour, or of his faith; the Holy Ghost descends upon him in lightning; Grace arrays him with wonderful power to sustain the war with coming Antichrist; Piety has bestowed upon him four stout oxen (the Evangelists) to till the earth; four bullocks to harrow the land (the four Latin Fathers), who harrow into it the Old and New Testaments; the grain which Piers sows is the cardinal virtues. The poem concludes with the resurrection and war of Antichrist, in which Piers, if victor, is hardly victor — “a cold and comfortless conclusion,” says the learned editor, Dr. Whitaker. I am persuaded that it is not the actual or the designed conclusion. The last Passage of Do Best can hardly have been intended to be so much shorter than the others. The

“There had been a loud cry, Lift up your heads, ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors.” At length,

“What Lord art thou? quoth Lucifer. A voice aLoud said,
The Lord of Might and of Heaven, that Made all things,
Duke of this Dim place. Anon unDo the gates
That Christ may comen in, the King's son of heaven.
And with that Break Hell Brake, with all Belial's Bars,
Nor any Wight or Ward Wide opened the gates,
Patriarchs and Prophets, Populus in tenebris,
Sang out with Saint John, Ecce Agnus Dei.”

I am tempted to give the close of this canto — so characteristic of the poem. He had said in Latin, Mercy and Charity have met together; Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other: —

“Truth Trumpeted them, and sung ‘Te Deum laudamus,’
And then saLuted Love, in a Loud note,
Ecce quam bonum et quam jocundum est habitare fratres in unum.
Till the Day Dawned, there Damaels Daunsed,
That men Rang to the Resurrection. And with that I awaked,
And called Kitty my wife, and Kalotte my daughter,
A Rise and go Reverence Gods Resurrection,
And Creep on knees to the Cross, and Kiss it for a jewel,
And Rightfullest of Reliques, none Richer on earth,
For Gods Blessed Body it Bare for our Bote (good).
And it a Feareth the Fiend; for such is the might,
May no Grisly Ghost Glide where it shadoweth.”

poet may have broken off indeed in sad despondency, and left his design unfinished; he may have been prevented from its completion; or, what is far less improbable, considering the way in which the Poem has survived, the end may have been lost.

The Poet who could address such opinions, though wrapt up in prudent allegory, to the popular ear, to the ear of the peasantry of England; the people who could listen with delight to such strains, were far advanced towards a revolt from Latin Christianity. Truth, true religion, was not to be found with, it was not known by, Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Clergy, Monks, Friars. It was to be sought by man himself, by the individual man, by the poorest man, under the sole guidance of Reason, Conscience, and of the Grace of God, vouchsafed directly, not through any intermediate human being, or even Sacrament, to the self-directing soul. If it yet respected all existing doctrines, it respected them not as resting on traditional or sacerdotal authority. There is a manifest appeal throughout, an unconscious installation of Scripture alone,¹ as the ultimate judge; the test of everything is a moral and purely religious one, its agreement with holiness and charity.

English prose in Wycliffe's Bible, the higher English poetry in its true father, Chaucer, maintained this prevailing and dominant Teutonism. Wycliffe's Bible,

¹ " And is Run to Religion, and hath Rendered the Bible,
And Preacheth to the People St. Paul's words."

Wright, p. 156.

He quotes, "Ye suffer fools gladly" (1 Cor.). Is this Wycliffe? Clergy (Theology) weds a wife; her name is Scripture. — Wright, p. 182. I take the opportunity of observing that the famous prophecy, ascribed to Langland, about the King who should suppress the monasteries, is merely a vague and general prediction; though the naming the Abbot of Abingdon is a lucky coincidence. — See Wright, p. 192.

as translated from the Vulgate, had not so entirely shaken off the trammels of Latinity as our later versions; but this first bold assertion of Teutonic independence immeasurably strengthened, even in its language, that independence. It tasked the language, as it were, to its utmost vigor, copiousness, and flexibility: and by thus putting it to the trial, forced out all those latent and undeveloped qualities. It was constantly striving to be English, and by striving became so more and more. Compare the freedom and versatility of Wycliffe's Bible with Wycliffe's Tracts. Wycliffe has not only advanced in the knowledge of purer and more free religion, he is becoming a master of purer and more free English.

Geoffrey Chaucer, among the most remarkable of poets, was in nothing more remarkable than in being most emphatically an English poet. Chaucer lived in courts and castles: he was in the service of the King, he was a retainer of the great Duke of Lancaster. In the court and in the castle, no doubt, if anywhere, with the Norman chivalrous magnificence lingered whatever remained of Norman manners and language. Chaucer had served in the armies of King Edward III.; he had seen almost all the more flourishing countries, many of the great cities, of the Continent, of Flanders, France, Italy. It may be but a romantic tradition, that at the wedding of Violante to the great Duke of Milan he had seen Petrarch, perhaps Boccaccio, and that Froissart too was present at that splendid festival. It may be but a groundless inference from a misinterpreted passage in his poems, that he had conversed with Petrarch (November, 1372); but there is unquestionable evidence that Chaucer was at Genoa under a commis-

sion from the Crown. He visited brilliant Florence, perhaps others of the noble cities of Italy. Five years later he was in Flanders and at Paris. In 1378 he went with the Embassy to demand the hand of a French Princess for the young Richard of Bordeaux. Still later he was at the gorgeous court of the Visconti at Milan.¹ Chaucer was master of the whole range of vernacular poetry, which was bursting forth in such young and prodigal vigor, in the languages born from the Romance Latin. He had read Dante, he had read Petrarch; to Boccaccio he owed the groundwork of two of his best poems—the Knight's Tale of Palamon and Arcite and Griselidis. I cannot but think that he was familiar with the Troubadour poetry of the *Langue d'Oc*; of the *Langue d'Oil*, he knew well the knightly tales of the *Trouvères* and the *Fabliaux*, as well as the later allegorical school, which was then in the height of its fashion in Paris. He translated the *Romance of the Rose*.

It is indeed extraordinary to see the whole of the mediæval, or post-mediæval poetry (with the great exception of the Dantesque vision of the other world) summed up, and as it were represented by Chaucer in one or more perfect examples, and so offered to the English people. There is the legend of martyrdom in *Constance of Surrie*; the miracle legend, not without its harsh alloy of hatred to the unbeliever, in *Hugh of Lincoln*; the wild, strange, stirring adventures told in the free prolix *Epopée* of the *Trouvère*, in its romanticized classic form, in *Troilus and Cressida*; in the wilder Oriental strain of magic and glamour in the half-

¹ Compare the lives of Chaucer, especially the latest by Sir Harris Nicolas.

told tale of Cambuscan; the chivalrous in Palamon and Arcite; to which perhaps may be added the noble Franklin's Tale. There is the Fablian in its best, in its tender and graceful form, in Griselidis; in its gayer and more licentious, in January and May; in its coarser, more broadly humorous, and, to our finer manners, repulsive, Miller's Tale; and in that of the Reve. The unfinished Sir Thopas might seem as if the spirit of Ariosto or Cervantes, or of lighter or later poets, was struggling for precocious being. There is the genial apologue of the Cock and the Fox, which might seem an episode from the universal brute Epic, the Latin, or Flemish, or German or French Reynard. The more cumbrous and sustained French allegory appears in the translation of the Romaunt of the Rose the more rich and simple in the Temple of Fame. There are a few slighter pieces which may call to mind the Lais and Serventes of the South.

Yet all the while Chaucer in thought, in character, in language, is English — resolutely, determinately, almost boastfully English.¹ The creation of native poetry was his deliberate aim; and already that broad, practical, humorous yet serious view of life, of life in its infinite variety, that which reaches its height in Shakspeare, has begun to reveal itself in Chaucer. The Canterbury Tales, even in the Preface, represent, as in a moving comedy, the whole social state of the times; they display human character in action as in

¹ There is a curious passage in the Prologue to the Testament of Love on the soveran wits in Latin and in French. "Let then Clerkes enditen in Latin, for they have the propertie of science, and the knowlege in that facultie; and let Frenchmen in their French also enditen their quaint termes, for it is kindly to their mouthes; and let us shew our fantasies in such wordes as wee learneden of our dames tongue." — Fol. 271.

speech ; and that character is the man himself, the whole man, with all his mingling, shifting, crossing contradictory passions, motives, peculiarities, his greatnesses and weaknesses, his virtues and his vanities every one is perfectly human, yet every one the individual man, with the very dress, gesture, look, speech, tone of the individual. There is an example of every order and class of society, high, low, secular, religious. As yet each is distinct in his class, as his class from others. Contrast Chaucer's pilgrims with the youths and damsels of Boccaccio. Exquisitely as these are drawn, and in some respects finely touched, they are all of one gay light class ; almost any one might tell any tale with equal propriety ; they differ in name, in nothing else.

In his religious characters, if not in his religious tales (religion is still man's dominant motive), Chaucer is by no means the least happy. In that which is purely religious the poet himself is profoundly religious ; in his Prayer to the Virgin, written for the Duchess Blanche of Lancaster, for whom also he poured forth his sad elegy ; in his Gentle Martyrs St. Constantia and St. Cecilia : he is not without his touch of bigotry, as has been said, in Hugh of Lincoln. But the strong Teutonic good sense of Chaucer had looked more deeply into the whole monastic and sacerdotal system. His wisdom betrays itself in his most mirthful, as in his coarsest humor. He who drew the Monk, the Pardoner, the Friar Limitour, the Summoner, had seen far more than the outer form, the worldliness of the Churchman, the abuse of indulgences, the extortions of the friars, the licentiousness of the Ecclesiastical Courts, of the Ecclesiastics themselves : he had pen-

etrated into the inner depths of the religion. Yet his wisdom, even in his most biting passages, is tempered with charity. Though every order, the Abbot, the Prioress, the Friar, the Pardoner, the Summoner, are impersonated to the life, with all their weaknesses, follies, affectations, even vices and falsehoods, in unsparing freedom, in fearless truth, yet none, or hardly one, is absolutely odious; the jolly hunting Abbot, with his dainty horses, their bridles jingling in the wind, his greyhounds, his bald shining head, his portly person, his hood fastened with a rich pin in a love-knot: the tender and delicate Prioress, with what we should now call her sentimentality, virtuous no doubt, but with her broad and somewhat suspicious motto about all-conquering love: the Friar, who so sweetly heard confession, and gave such pleasant absolution, urging men, instead of weeping and prayers, to give silver to the friars; with his lisping voice and twinkling eyes, yet the best beggar in his house, to whom the poorest widow could not deny a farthing: the Pardoner with his wallet in his lap, brimful of pardons from Rome, with his relics or pillowbeer covered with part of our Lady's veil and the glass vessel with pig's bones: yet in Church the Pardoner was a noble Ecclesiast, read well, chanted with such moving tones, that no one could resist him and not throw silver into the offertory. The Summoner, whose office and the Archdeacon's Court in which he officiated seem to have been most unpopular, is drawn in the darkest colors, with his fire-red cherubim's face, lecherous, venal, licentious. Above all, the Parish Priest of Chaucer has thrown off Roman mediæval Sacerdotalism; he feels his proper place; he arrays himself only in the virtues which are the essence

of his holy function. This unrivalled picture is the most powerful because the most quiet, uninsulting, unexasperating satire. Chaucer's Parish Priest might have been drawn from Wycliffe, from Wycliffe at Lutterworth, not at Oxford, from Wycliffe, not the fierce controversialist, but the affectionate and beloved teacher of his humble flock. The Priest's Tale is a sermon, prolix indeed, but, except in urging confession and holding up the confessorial office of the Priesthood, purely and altogether moral in its scope and language.¹ The translation of the Romaunt of the Rose, with all its unmitigated bitterness against the Friars, is a further illustration of the religious mind of Chaucer. If we could interpret with any certainty the allegory and the mystic and poetic prose in the Testament of Love, we might hope for more light on the religion and on the later period of Chaucer's life.² It is evident that at that time, towards the close of his life, he was in disgrace and in prison. Other documents show that his pensions or allowances from the Crown were, for a time at least, withdrawn. There is no doubt that his imprisonment arose out of some turbulent and popular movements in the City of London. There is every probability that these movements were connected with the struggle to reinvest the Wycliffite (and so long as the Lancastrian party was Wycliffite) Lancastrian

¹ I have little doubt that in the Retractation ascribed to Chaucer at the close of this Sermon, Tyrwhitt is right in that part which he marks for interpolation. Read the passage without it, all is clear.

² Speght in his argument to the Testament of Love, if it be Speght's. "Chaucer did compile this booke as a comfort to himselfe after great greeces conceived for some rash attempts of the Commons, with which hee had joyned, and thereby was in feare to lose the favour of his best friends." — Fol. 272.

Mayor,¹ John of Northampton in the civic dignity. The Londoners were Lollards, and if on the people's side, Chaucer was on the Lollards' side. Chaucer, in his imprisonment, would, like Boethius of old, from whom the Testament of Love was imitated, seek consolation, but his consolation is in religion, not philosophy. His aspiration is after the beautiful and all-excelling Margarita, the pearl of great price, who, like the Beatrice of Dante, seems at once an ideal or idealized mistress, and the impersonation of pure religion. Love alone can bestow on him this precious boon; and divine love, as usual, borrowing some of its imagery and language from human love, purifies and exalts the soul of the poet for this great blessing by imparting the knowledge of God in the works of his power, and the works of his grace and glory. More than this the obstinate obscurity of the allegory refuses to reveal.

We must turn again to Germany, which we left in its intermediate state of slowly dawning Teutonism. Germany, it has been seen, rejected the first free movement of her kindred Teutons in England, because it was taken up with such passionate zeal by the hostile Slavonians. The reformation in Bohemia, followed by its wild and cruel wars, civil and foreign, threw back the German mind in aversion and terror upon Latin Christianity. Yet Teutonism only slumbered, it was not extinguished; it was too deeply rooted;

¹ See the whole very curious but obscure passage, fol. 277: "Then, Lady, I thought that every man that by anye way of right, rightfully done, may helpe any commune (helpe) to been saved." Chaucer was in the secrets of his party, which he was urged to betray. He goes on to speak of the "cite of London, which is to me so deare and sweet, in which I was forth growne; and more kindly love have I to that place than to anye other m yearth."

it had been slowly growing up from its undying root for centuries. The strife of ages between the Emperor and the Pope could not but leave a profound jealousy, and even antipathy, in a great mass of the nation. Throughout there had been a strong Imperialist, a German faction. The haughty aggression of John XXII. (a Pontiff not on the Papal throne at Rome) was felt as a mere wanton and unprovoked insult. It was not now the Pope asserting against the Emperor the independence of Italy or of Rome; not defending Rome and Italy from the aggression of Transalpine barbarians by carrying the war against the Emperor into Germany. Louis of Bavaria would never have descended into Italy if the Pope had left him in peace on his own side of the Alps. The shame of Germany at the pusillanimity of Louis of Bavaria wrought more strongly on German pride: the Pope was more profoundly hated for the self-sought humiliation of the Emperor. At the same time the rise of the great and wealthy commercial cities had created a new class with higher aspirations for freedom than their turbulent princes and nobles, who were constantly in league with the Pope against the Emperor, of whom they were more jealous than of the Pope; or than the Prince Bishops, who would set up a hierarchical instead of a papal supremacy. The burghers, often hostile to their Bishops, and even to the cathedral Chapters, with whom they were at strife for power and jurisdiction in their towns, seized perpetually the excuse of their papalizing to eject their Prelates, and to erect their lower Clergy into a kind of spiritual Republic. The Schism had prostrated the Pope before the temporal power; the Emperor

of Germany had compelled the Pope to summon a Council; at that Council he had taken the acknowledged lead, had almost himself deposed a Pope. It is true that at the close he had been out-manœuvred by the subtle and pertinacious Churchman; Martin V. had regained the lost ground; a barren, ambiguous, delusive Concordat had baffled the peremptory demand of Germany for a reformation of the Church in its head and in its members.¹ Yet even at the height of the Bohemian war, dark, deepening murmurs were heard of German cities, German Princes joining the Antipapal movement. During the Council of Basle, when Latin Christianity was severed into two oppugnant parties, that of the Pope Eugenius IV. and that of the Transalpine reforming hierarchy, Germany had stood aloof in cold, proud neutrality: but for the subtle policy of one man, Æneas Sylvius, and the weak and yielding flexibility of another, the Emperor Frederick III., there might have been a German spiritual nationality, a German independent Church. The Pope was compelled to the humiliation of restoring the Prelate Electors whom he had dared to degrade, to degrade their successors whom he had appointed. Gregory of Heimberg, the representative of the German mind, had defied the Roman Court in Rome itself, had denounced Papal haughtiness to the face of the Pope.² But for one

¹ Ranke has written thus (I should not quote in English, if the English were not Mrs. Austin's): "Had this course been persevered in with union and constancy, the German Catholic Church, established in so many great principalities, and splendidly provided with the most munificent endowments, would have acquired a perfectly independent position, in which she might have resisted the subsequent political storms with as much firmness as England." — *Reformation in Germany*, vol. i. p. 48.

² Ranke, p. 49. Compare these passages above.

event, all the policy of Æneas Sylvius, and all the subserviency of Frederick III. to him who he supposed was his counsellor, but who was his ruler, had been unavailing. As the aggressive crusade to Palestine gave the dominion of Latin Christendom to the older Popes, so the defensive crusade against the terrible progress of the Turk, which threatened both Teutonic and Latin Christendom, placed the Pope again at the head, not in arms, but in awe and influence, of the whole West. Germany and the Pope were in common peril, they were compelled to close alliance. In justice to Æneas Sylvius, when Pius II., it may be acknowledged that it was his providential sagacity, his not ungrounded apprehension of the greatness of the danger, which made him devote his whole soul to the league against the Ottoman; if it was also wise policy, as distracting the German mind from dangerous meditations of independence, this even with Pius II. was but a secondary and subordinate consideration. The Turk was the cause of the truce of more than half a century between the Papacy and the Empire.

But throughout all that time the silent growth of the German languages, the independent Teutonic thought expressed in poetry, even in preaching, was widening the alienation. During the century and a half in which English Teutonism was resolutely bracing itself to practical and political religious independence, and the English language ripening to its masculine force, with the Anglo-Saxon successfully wrestling for the mastery against the Southern Latin; in Germany a silent rebellious mysticism was growing up even in her cloisters, and working into the depths of

men's hearts and minds. The movement was more profound, more secret, and unconscious even among those most powerfully under its influence. There was not only the open insurrection of Marsilio of Padua and William of Ockham against the Papal or hierarchical authority, and the wild revolt of the Fraticelli; there was likewise at once an acknowledgment of and an attempt to satisfy that yearning of the religious soul for what the Church, the Latin Church, had ceased to supply, which was no longer to be found in the common cloister-life, which the new Orders had ceased to administer to the wants of the people. During this time, too, while Germany luxuriated in the Romance Legend, as well as in the Chivalrous Romance, and the Hymn still in some degree vied with the Lay of the Minnesinger, German prose had grown up and was still growing up out of vernacular preaching. From the earliest period some scanty instruction, catechet-^{German preaching.} ical or oral, from the glosses or from fragments of the Scripture, had been communicated in German to the people: some German homilies, translated from the Latin, had been in use. But the great impulse was given by the new Orders. The Dominican Conrad of Marburg had been forced at times to leave the over-crowded church for the open air, on account of the multitudes which gathered round the fierce Inquisitor, to hear his sermons, to witness the conclusion of his sermons, the burning of a holocaust of heretics. Far different was the tone of the Franciscan Bertholdt of Winterthur,¹ who from 1247 to Bertholdt.

¹ Compare Leyser, *Einleitung. Deutsche Predigten des viii. und xiv. Jahrhunderts*, Quedlinburg, 1838, p. xvi., for the life of Bertholdt. Gervinus

1272 preached with amazing success throughout Bavaria, Austria, Moravia, Thuringia. His sermons, taken down by the zeal of his hearers, were popular in the best sense; he had the instinct of eloquence; he is even now by the best judges set above Tauler himself. In earnestness, in energy, in his living imagery from external nature, Bertholdt was the popular preacher in the open field, on the hill-side, Tauler the contemplative monk in the pulpit of the cloister-chapel.¹ Nor did Bertholdt stand alone in these vivid popular addresses. That which, notwithstanding these examples, was at least inefficiently bestowed by the Church, stirring and awakening vernacular instruction, was prodigally poured forth from other quarters. The dissidents under their various names, and the Beghards, were everywhere. At the beginning of the fourteenth century Alsace was almost in possession of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit; they were driven out and scattered, but expulsion and dispersion, if it does not multiply the numbers, usually increases the force and power of such communities.² Mysticism within the Church strove to fill the void caused by their expulsion. Of these Mystics the most famous names are Rysbroeck of Cologne, Master Eckhart, John Tauler, Nicolas of Suso. The life of Tauler will show us the times and the personal influence of these men, and that of their opinions. It occupies all the early part of the fourteenth century.

(Deutsche Poesie) writes, "Die Vortrefflichkeit der Bertholdt'schen Predigten, die weit die Schriften Taulers übertrifft." — Vol. ii. p. 142. Schmidt, Joannes Tauler, p. 82.

¹ Leyser, Deutsche Predigten.

² Schmidt, Tauler, p. 7. In 1317, there was a violent persecution by John of Ochsenstein, Bishop of Strasburg.

John Tauler¹ was born in Strasburg in 1290. At the age of eighteen the religious youth entered the Dominican cloister. He went to study at Paris; but at Paris the Doctors were ever turning over the leaves of huge books, they cared not for the one book of life.² Probably on his return to Strasburg he came under the influence of Master Eckhart. This remarkable man preached in German; countless hearers thronged even to Eckhart's vernacular sermons. But Eckhart was a Schoolman in the incongruous office of a popular preacher; he was more than a Schoolman, he aspired to be a philosopher. His was not a passionate, simple, fervent theology, but the mystic divinity of Dionysius the Areopagite; it approached the Arabic Aristotelian philosophy. He held, indeed, the Creation out of nothing, and in theory repudiated the Eternity of Matter; but Creation seemed a necessity of the divine nature. The Universal could not but be particular; so God was all things, and all things were God. The soul came forth from God, it was an emanation; it had part of the light of God, in itself inextinguishable, but that light required kindling and quickening by divine grace.³ Thus man stands between the spiritual and the corporeal, between time and eternity. God will reveal himself fully, pour himself wholly into the reasonable soul of man. It is not by love but by in-

¹ Joannes Tauler von Strasburg, von D. Carl Schmidt. Hamburg, 1841.

² Tauler, p. 8. Quotation from Tauler's Sermon in note.

³ See the Chapter on Eckhart. Ritter, Christliche Philosophie, iv. p. 498, &c. "Eckhart ist mit den Theologen seiner Zeit von der Ueberzeugung durchdrungen, dass die vernünftige Seele des Menschen dazu bestimmt sei in der innigsten Verbindung mit Gott, des höchsten Gutes, ganz und ohne alle Schmälerung, theilhaftig zu werden . . . Gott soll sich ganz offenbaren, wir ihn ganz erkennen: er soll ganz unser werden." — P. 502.

telligence that the mystic reunion takes place with God; by knowledge we are one with God; that which knows and that which is known are one. Master Eckhart is the parent of German metaphysical theology. But if Tauler was caught with the glowing language in which Eckhart clothed these colder opinions, he stood aloof from the kindred teaching of the Beghards, with their more passionate, more religious Pantheism — the same in thought with Eckhart, more bold and fearless in expression.

But if of itself the soul of Tauler sought a deeper and more fervent faith, the dark and turbulent times would isolate or make such a soul seek its sympathy within a narrower circle. It was the height of the war between John XXII. and Louis of Bavaria, and nowhere did that war rage more violently than in Strasburg. The Bishop John of Ochsenstein was for the Pope, the Magistrates, the people, for the Emperor, or rather for insulted Germany. The Bishop laid his interdict on the city; the Magistrates, the Town Council, declared that the Clergy who would not perform their functions must be driven from the city.¹ The Clergy, the Monks, the Friars, were divided: here the bells were silent, the churches closed; there they tolled for prayers, and the contumacious Clergy performed forbidden services. No wonder that religious men sought that religion in themselves which they found not in the church or in the cloister; they took refuge in the sanctuary of their own thoughts, from the religion which

¹ "Do soltent su ouch fürbas singen,
Oder aber us der statt springen."

Königshofen Chronicle, 122-3.

Schmidt, p. 14.

was contesting the world. In all the great cities rose a secret unorganized brotherhood, bound together only by silent infelt sympathies, the Friends of God. This appellation was a secession, a tacit revolt, an assumption of superiority. God was not to be worshipped in the church alone, with the Clergy alone, with the Monks alone, in the Ritual, even in the Sacraments; he was within, in the heart, in the life. This and kindred brotherhoods embraced all orders, Priests, Monks, Friars, Nobles, Burghers, Peasants; they had their Prophets and Prophetesses, above all, their Preachers.¹

¹ On the "Friends of God," see Schmidt, Anhang. M. Carl Schmidt has now discovered and printed some very curious documents, which throw more full but yet dubious light on the "Friends of God," and their great leader Nicolas of Basle. They were Mystics to the height of Mysticism: each believer was in direct union with God, with the Trinity not the Holy Ghost alone. They were not Waldensians. They were faithful to the whole mediæval imaginative creed, Transubstantiation, worship of the Virgin and Saints, Purgatory. Their union with the Deity was not that of Pantheism, or of passionate love; it was rather through the fantasy. They had wonders, visions, special revelations, prophecies. Their peculiar heresy was the denial of all special prerogative to the Clergy, except the celebration of the Sacraments; the layman had equal sanctity, equal communion with the Deity, saw visions, uttered prophecies. Their only sympathy with the Waldensians was Anti-Sacerdotalism. Neither were they Biblical Christians; they honored, loved the Bible, but sought and obtained revelation beyond it. They rejected one clause of the Lord's Prayer. Temptations were marks of God's favor not to be deprecated. But though suffering was a sign of the Divine Love, it was not self-inflicted suffering. They disclaimed asceticism, self-maceration, self-torture. All things to the beloved were of God; all therefore indifferent, seclusion, poverty. In 1367 Nicolas of Basle, with his twelve friends or disciples (so commanded by a dream), set forth from the Oberland under the guidance of a dog to find a domicile. After a wild journey over moss and moor, the dog barked and scratched up the earth. They determined to build (with the permission of the Duke of Austria to whom the land belonged) a chapel, with a pleasant chamber for each; here they dwelt, recluses, not monks, under no vows, withdrawn from the world, but well informed of what passed in the world. Eight of them afterwards went into foreign lands to Hungary, to Italy.

They had other places of retreat, and it should seem multitudes of followers attached to them with more or less intimacy. Nicolas of Basle, as

Some convents were entirely in their power. In one thing alone they sided with the Town Councils—in denouncing the unlawfulness, the wickedness of closing the churches against the poor; they rejected the monstrous doctrine that the Pope and the Bishops might withhold the blessings of religion from the many for the sins, or what they chose to call the sins, of the few. Christian love was something higher, holier than Bishop or than Pope. John Tauler was an earnest disciple, a powerful apostle of this lofty mysticism; he preached with wonderful success in Strasburg, in some of the neighboring convents, in towns and villages, in the cities. He journeyed even to Cologne, the seat of this high mysticism; there the famous Rysbroeck taught with the utmost power and popularity. Tauler was often at Basle, where Henry of Nordlingen, who had respected the Papal interdict at Constance, resumed his forbidden functions. Tauler threw aside all scholastic subtilties; he strove to be plain, simple, com-

pecially inspired, held boundless influence and authority over all, whether "Friends of God," or not, over Tauler, Rulman Merswin, and others.

As the days of the Church grew darker under the later Popes at Avignon, and during the Schism, visions, dreams multiplied and darkened around them. Nicolas visited Gregory XI. at Rome; he reproved the Pope's inertness, his sins. Gregory, at first indignant, was overawed, and won by the commanding holiness of Nicolas. In 1278 Nicolas with his followers prayed together from the 17th to the 25th March to God, to dispel the dark weather which overhung the Church. They were directed to "wait." The time of "waiting" lasted to March 25th, 1383. In the mean time they scrupled not to speak with the utmost freedom of the Pope and the Clergy. They disclaimed both Popes. Many awful visions were seen by many believers; many terrible prophecies were sent abroad.

At length Nicolas and some of his chief followers set out as preachers of repentance. In 1393 Martin of Maintz was buried in Cologne; others in Heidelberg; Nicolas with two of his chief and constant disciples at Vienne in Dauphiny.—See *die Gottesfreunde in xiv. Jahrhundert* von Carl Schmidt. Iena, 1855.

prehensible to the humblest understanding ; he preached in German, but still with deferential citations in Latin. Tauler sought no Papal license ; it was his mission, it was his imperative duty as a Priest, to preach the Gospel.

But Tauler was to undergo a sterner trial, to be trained in another school. In Basle he had been marked by men of a different cast, the gauge of his mind had been taken, the depth of his heart sounded, his religion weighed and found wanting. In Strasburg appeared a stranger who five times sat at the feet of Tauler, and listened to his preaching with serious, searching earnestness. He was a layman, he sought an interview with Tauler, confessed to him, received the Sacrament at his hands. He then expressed his wish that Tauler would preach how man could attain perfection, that perfection to which he might aspire on earth. Tauler preached his loftiest mysticism. The stern man now spoke with authority, the authority of a more determinate will, and more firm convictions. "Thou art yet in slavery to the letter ; thou knowest not the life-giving spirit ; thou art but a Pharisee ; thou trustest in thine own power, in thine own learning ; thou thinkest that thou seekest God's honor, and seekest thine own." Tauler shuddered. "Never man before reproved me for my sins." He felt the spell of a master. "Twelve years," said the layman (who was rebuking the self-righteousness of Tauler !), "I have been toiling to the height of spiritual perfection, which I have now attained, by the study of German works, by self-mortification and chastisements which have now ceased to be necessary." He gave Tauler certain simple moral rules, counselled him to preach no more, to

hear no more confession, to deny himself, and to meditate on the life and death of Christ till he had attained humility and regeneration.¹ The stronger, the more positive and peremptory mind subdued the gentler. Tauler, for above two years, despite the wonder of his friends, the taunts of his enemies, was silent. The first time, at the end of that period, when he attempted, A.D. 1340. under permission (for the inflexible layman watched him unceasingly), he broke down in floods of tears. This stranger was the famous Nicolas of Basle. The secret influence of these teachers, unsuppressed by years of persecution, may appear from the work thus wrought on the mind of Tauler, and from the fact that it was not till towards the close of the century, long after Tauler's death, that Nicolas of Basle, venturing into France, was seized and burned as a heretic at Vienne in Dauphiny.

Tauler adhered to the Church; many of the Waldenses and others did so to escape persecution,² and to infuse their own zeal; Tauler, it seems, in honesty and simplicity. But from that time the German preaching of Tauler — now unmingled with Latin, in churches, in private assemblies, in the houses of Beguines, in nunneries — was more plain, earnest, and, as usual, flowed from his own heart to the hearts of others. He taught estrangement from the world, self-denial, pov-

¹ D. Carl Schmidt has taken the whole of this from an old narrative "of a Teacher of Holy Scripture and a Layman," of which he does not doubt the authenticity. It is well translated in Miss Winkworth's *Life and Times of Tauler*. London, 1857.

² "Auf diese Weise die Waldenser in die Kirche selber Eingang fanden und auf die berühmtesten Doctoren und namlich auf Dominicaner, deren Beruf es war die Ketzer zu bekämpfen, so mächtig wirkten." — Schmidt, p. 37. But M. Schmidt's new authorities show that Nicolas was not a Waldensian.

erty of spirit, not merely passive surrender of the soul to God, but, with this, love also to the brethren and the discharge of the duties of life. Men were to seek peace, during these turbulent times, within their own souls. He not only preached in German, he published in German, "the following the lowly life of Christ."¹ The black plague fell on the city of Stras- A.D. 1348-9. burg, on Strasburg still under the ban of the Pope. In Strasburg died 16,000, in Basle 14,000 victims. Amid these terrible times of wild visions, wild processions of self-scourged penitents, of crowded cloisters, massacred Jews, the calm voice of Tauler, and of some who spoke and wrote in the spirit of Tauler, rose against the unpitying Church. A remonstrance was addressed to the Clergy, that the poor, innocent, blameless people were left to die untended, unabsolved, under the interdict, and boldly condemning the Priests who refused them the last consolations of the Gospel.² "Christ died for all men; the Pope cannot, by his interdict, close heaven against those who die innocent." In another writing the abuse of the spiritual sword was clearly denounced, the rights of the Electors asserted. The broad maxim was laid down, that "he who confesses the true faith of Christ, and sins only against the person of the Pope, is no heretic." It is said that the people took comfort, and died in peace, though under the Papal interdict. It was for these unforgiven opinions that Tauler and his friends, Thomas of Strasburg, an Augustinian, and Ludolph of Saxony, first a Dominican then a Carthusian, fell under the suspicion of the new Bishop Bertholdt and the Clergy. He had

¹ Der Nachfolgung des armen Lebens Christi.

² Schmidt, Tauler, p. 52.

been called to render an account of his faith before A.D. 1348. Charles IV., "the Priests' Emperor," when at Strasburg. The Mystics were commanded to recant, and to withdraw from their writings these obnoxious tenets.

Tauler disappeared from Strasburg; he was now heard in Cologne; there he taught his own simpler doctrines, and protested against the Pantheistic tenets of the Beghards, and even of those dreamy fanatics who would yield up their passive souls to the working of Divine grace. He returned to Strasburg only to die. A.D. 1361. His last hours were passed in the garden of the convent in which his only sister had long dwelt, a holy and blameless nun. He sought her gentle aid and consolation. One hard Mystic reproached his weakness in yielding to this last earthly affection. He was buried in the cloisters, amid the respectful sorrow of the whole city.

Tauler had been dead nearly a century before the close of our History, but his Sermons lived in the memory of men; they were transcribed with pious solicitude, and disseminated among all who sought something beyond what was taught in the Church, or taught by the Clergy; that which the Ritual, performed perhaps by a careless, proud, or profligate Priest, did not suggest; which was not heard in the cold and formal Confessional; which man might learn for himself, teach to himself, which brought the soul in direct relation with God, trained it to perfection, to communion, to assimilation, to unity with God. Herder, perhaps the wisest of German critics, condemns the Sermons of Tauler for their monotony:¹

¹ The two latter parts of Dr. Schmidt's Tauler are on the writings and

“He who has read two of Tauler’s Sermons has read all.”¹ But perhaps in that monotony lay much of their strength. Religious men seek not variety but emotion; it is the key-note which vibrates to the heart. Tauler had Mysticism enough to awaken and keep alive all the most passionate sentiments of religion, yet with a seeming clearness and distinctness as if addressed to the reason; his preaching appeared at least to be intelligible; it addressed the whole man, his imagination, his reason, his affection.

But Tauler’s Mysticism was far beyond the sublime selfishness of the Imitation of Christ; it embraced fully, explicitly the love of others; it resembled the Imitation of à Kempis, in that it was absolutely and entirely personal religion, self-wrought out, self-disciplined, self-matured, with nothing necessarily intermediate between the grace of God and the soul of man. The man might be perfect in spirit and in truth within himself, spiritualized only by the Holy Ghost. Tauler’s perfect man was a social being, not a hermit; his goodness spread on earth, it was not all drawn up to heaven. Though the perfect man might not rise above duties, he might rise above observances; though never free from the law of love to his fellow-creatures, he claimed a dangerous freedom as regarded the law and usage of the Church, and dependence on the ministers of the Church. Those who were content with ritual observances, however obedient, were still imperfect; outward rites, fastings, were good as means, but the soul must liberate itself from all these

doctrines of Tauler, illustrated with abundant extracts. Miss Winkworth has well chosen, and rendered well some of his best Sermons. 1857.

¹ Theologische Briefe 41, quoted by Schmidt, p. 84.

outward means. The soul, having discharged all this, must still await in patience something higher, something to which all this is but secondary, inferior; having attained perfection, it may cast all these things away as unnecessary. Tauler's disciple respects the laws of the Church because they are the laws of the Church; he does not willingly break them, but he is often accused of breaking them when intent on higher objects. But the whole vital real work in man is within. Penance is nought without contrition: "Mortify not the poor flesh, but mortify sin." Man must confess to God; unless man forsakes sin, the absolution of Pope and Cardinals is of no effect; the Confessor has no power over sin. Tauler's religion is still more inflexibly personal: "His own works make not a man holy, how can those of others? Will God regard the rich man who buys for a pitiful sum the prayers of the poor? Not the intercession of the Virgin, nor of all the Saints, can profit the unrepentant sinner."

All this, if not rebellion, was sowing the seeds of rebellion against the sacerdotal domination; if it was not the proclamation, it was the secret murmur preparatory for the assertion of Teutonic independence.

Tauler lived not only in his writings; the cherished treasure of Mysticism was handed down by minds of kindred spirit for nearly two centuries. When they were appealed to by Luther as the harbingers of his own more profound and powerful religiousness, the Friends of God subsisted, if not organized, yet maintaining visibly if not publicly their succession of Apostolic holiness.

Ten years after the death of Tauler, Nicolas of

Basle, not yet having ventured on his fatal mission into France, is addressing a long and pious monition to the Brethren of St. John in Strasburg.¹

Near the close of the century, Martin, a Monk, was arraigned at Cologne as an infatuated disciple of Nicolas of Basle.² From this process it appears that many Friends of God had been recently burned at Heidelberg.³ The heresies with which Martin is charged are obviously misconceptions, if not misrepresentations, of the doctrine of perfection taught by Tauler and by most of the German Mystics.

Tauler was thus only one of the voices, if the most powerful and influential, which as it were appealed directly to God from the Pope and the Hierarchy; which asserted a higher religion than that of the Church; which made salvation dependent on personal belief and holiness, not on obedience to the Priest; which endeavored to renew the long-dissolved wedlock between Christian faith and Christian morality; and tacitly at least, if not inferentially, admitted the great Wycliffite doctrine, that the bad Pope, the bad Bishop, the bad Priest, was neither Pope, Bishop, nor Priest. It was an appeal to God, and also to the moral sense

¹ Schmidt, Anhang 5, p. 233, dated 1377.

² "Quod quidam Laicus nomine Nicolaus de Basilea, cui te funditus remisisti, clarius et perfectius evangelium quam aliqui Apostoli, et beatus Paulus hoc intellexerit quod prædicto Nicolao ex perfectione submissionis sibi facta contra præcepta cujuscunque Prælati etiam Papæ licite et sine peccato obedire." — He was accused of having said, That he was restored to his state of primitive innocence, emancipated from obedience of the Church, with full liberty to preach and administer the Sacraments without license of the Church. Of course the charge was darkened into the grossest Antinomianism.

³ 1393. "Quod judicialiter convicti et per ecclesiam condemnati ac impenitentes heretici aliquando in Heidelbergâ concremati fuerunt et sunt amici Dei." — Anhang 6, p. 238.

of man ; and throughout this period of nearly two centuries which elapsed before the appearance of Luther, this inextinguishable torch passed from hand to hand, from generation to generation. Its influence was seen in the earnest demand for Reformation by the Councils ; the sullen estrangement, notwithstanding the reunion to the sacerdotal yoke, during the Hussite wars ; the disdainful neutrality when reformation by the Councils seemed hopeless ; it is seen in the remarkable book, the " German Theology," attributed by Luther to Tauler himself, but doubtless of a later period.¹ Ruder and coarser works, in all the jarring and various dialects, betrayed the German impatience, the honest but homely popular alienation from ecclesiastical dominion, and darkly foreshowed that when the irresistible Revolution should come, it would be more popular, more violent, more irreconcilable.

¹ Two translations have recently appeared in England of this book, of which the real character and importance cannot be appreciated without a full knowledge of the time at which it originally appeared. It was not so much what it taught as " German Theology," but what it threw aside, as no part of genuine Christian Faith.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

LITERATURE was thus bursting loose from Latin Christianity; it had left the cloister to converse with men of the world; it had ceased to be the prerogative of the Hierarchy, and had begun to expatiate in new regions. In Italy ere long, as in its classical studies, so in the new Platonism of Mársilius Ficinus and the Florentine school, it almost threatened to undermine Christianity, or left a Christianity which might almost have won the assent of the Emperor Julian. In all the Teutonic races it had begun to assert its freedom from sacerdotal authority; its poets, even its preachers, were all but in revolt.

But Art was more faithful to her munificent patron, her bold and prolific creator, her devout wor-
 shipper. Of all the arts Architecture was Architecture faithful to the Church. that which owed the most glorious triumphs to Christianity. Architecture must still be the slave of wealth and power, for majestic, durable, and costly buildings can arise only at their command; and wealth and power were still to a great extent in the hands of the Hierarchy. The first sign and prophetic omen of the coming revolution was when in the rich commercial cities the town-halls began to vie in splendor with the Churches and Monasteries. Yet nobler gratitude,

if such incentive were possible, might attach Architecture to the cause of the Church. Under the Church she had perfected old forms, invented new ; she had risen to an unrivalled majesty of design and skill in construction. In her stateliness, solemnity, richness, boldness, variety, vastness, solidity, she might compete with the whole elder world, and might almost defy future ages.

Latin Christianity, during a period of from ten to Churches
in Latin
Christendom. twelve centuries, had covered the whole of Western Europe with its still multiplying Churches and religious buildings. From the Southern shores of Sicily to the Hebrides and the Scandinavian kingdoms, from the doubtful borders of Christian Spain to Hungary, Poland, Prussia, not a city was without its Cathedral, surrounded by its succursal churches, its monasteries, and convents, each with its separate church or chapel. There was not a town but above the lowly houses, almost entirely of wood, rose the churches of stone or some other solid material, in their superior dignity, strength, dimensions, and height ; not a village was without its sacred edifice : no way-side without its humbler chapel or oratory. Not a river but in its course reflected the towers and pinnacles of many abbeys ; not a forest but above its lofty oaks or pines appeared the long-ridged roof, or the countless turrets of the conventual church and buildings. Even now, after periods in some countries of rude religious fanaticism, in one, France (next to Italy, or equally with Italy prodigal in splendid ecclesiastical edifices), after a decade of wild irreligious iconoclasm ; after the total suppression or great reduction, by the common consent of Christendom, of monastic institutions, the seculariza-

tion of their wealth, and the abandonment of their buildings to decay and ruin ; our awe and wonder are still commanded, and seem as if they would be commanded for centuries, by the unshaken solidity, spaciousness, height, majesty, and noble harmony of the cathedrals and churches throughout Western Europe. We are amazed at the imagination displayed in every design, at the enormous human power employed in their creation ; at the wealth which commanded, the consummate science which guided that power ; at the profound religious zeal which devoted that power, wealth, and science to these high purposes.

The progress and development of this Christian Architecture, Roman, Byzantine, Romanesque or Lombard, Norman, Gothic in its successive forms, could not be compressed into a few pages : the value of such survey must depend on its accuracy and truth, its accuracy and truth on the multiplicity and fulness of its details and on the fine subtilty of its distinctions, and might seem to demand illustration from other arts. It is hardly less difficult to express in a narrow compass the religious hierarchical, and other convergent causes which led to the architectural Christianization of the West in its two great characteristic forms. These forms may perhaps be best described as Cisalpine (Italian) and Transalpine (Gothic), though neither of them respected the boundary of the other, and the Teutonic Gothic in the North arose out of the Southern Romanesque.

Our former history has surveyed Christian Architecture in its origin ; it has traced the primitive form of the churches in the East ;¹ so far as they differed

¹ History of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 298. Church of Tyre, described by Eusebius.

in their distribution from the Western, resembling the Pagan rather than the Jewish temple, yet of necessity assuming their own peculiar and distinct character. It has seen in the West the Basilica, the great hall of imperial justice, offering its more commodious plan and arrangements, and becoming with far less alteration a Christian edifice for public worship and instruction.¹ This first epoch of Christian Architecture extended, even after the conversion of Constantine and the building of Constantinople, to the reign of Justinian, under whom Byzantine Architecture, properly so distinguished, drew what may be called the architectural division between the East and the West. Even in Architecture the Greek and Latin Churches were to be oppugnant; though the Byzantine, as will appear, made a strong effort, and not without partial success, to subjugate the West.

To Rome, not to Greece, Christian Architecture owed its great elementary principle, the key-stone, as it were, to all its greatness; and this principle was carried out with infinitely greater boldness and fulness in the West than in the East. And surely it is no fanciful analogy that, as the Roman character contributed so powerfully to the great hierarchical system of the West, so the Roman form of building influenced most extensively Christian Architecture, temporarily and imperfectly that of the East, in perpetuity that of the Latin world. After a few centuries the more dominant hierarchism of the West is manifest in the oppugnancy between Greek and Latin Church Architecture. The East having once wrought out its architectural type and model settled down in

Roman
architecture.

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 411, 415, and vol. iii p 488.

unprogressive, uncreative acquiescence, and went on copying that type with servile and almost undeviating uniformity. In the West, within certain limits, with certain principles, and with a fixed aim, there was freedom, progression, invention. There was a stately unity, unity which seemed to imply immemorial antiquity, and to aspire to be an unalterable irrepealable law for perpetuity, in the form and distribution, in the proportions and harmony of the sacred buildings ; but in the details, in the height, the dimensions, the character, the ornaments, the mechanical means of support, infinite inexhaustible variety ; it ranged from the most bare and naked Romanesque up to the most gorgeous Gothic.¹

Latin Christianity by its centralization, its organization arising out of Roman respect for law and usage, its rigid subordination, its assertion of and its submission to authority, with a certain secondary freedom of action, had constituted its vast ecclesiastical polity ; so one great architectural principle carried out in infinite variety and boundless extent, yet in mutual support

¹ Compare Hope on Architecture, p. 59. All that has been discovered of the knowledge and use of the Arch in Egypt and in other countries, tends to the same result as that to which Mr. Hope arrived : " The Arch which the Greeks knew not, or if they knew, did not employ." So with other nations. It was first among the Romans an elementary and universal principle of construction. It is impossible not to refer with respect to the first modern philosophical and comprehensive work on Architecture, that by the author of *Anastasius*. Some corrections, manifold details, much scientific knowledge, have been added by the countless writers on Christian Architecture, of which England has furnished her full share, — Whewell, Willis, Petit, the Author of the *Glossary of Architecture*, the late Mr. Gally Knight. But who of all these will not own his obligations to Mr. Hope ? The recollection of much friendly kindness in my youth enhances the pleasure with which I pay this tribute to a man of real and original genius.

and mutual dependence, that of the Arch (if not absolutely unknown, of rare and exceptional application among the Greeks), had given solidity and stability to the gigantic structures of Rome, which spread out and soared above each other in ambitious unending rivalry. Hence the power of multiplying harmonious parts, of enclosing space to almost infinite dimensions, of supporting almost in the air the most ponderous roofs, of making a vast complicated whole, one in design, one in structure, one in effect. The Greek temples and the Roman temples on the Greek model, limited in size and extent by the necessity of finding support for horizontal pressure, were usually isolated edifices, each in its exquisite harmony and perfection, complete, independent, simple. If they were sometimes crowded together, as in the Acropolis of Athens, or the Forum at Rome, yet each stood by itself in its narrow precincts; it was a separate republic, as it were the domain and dwelling of its own God, the hall of its own priesthood.

But through that single principle of the Arch the Roman had attained a grandeur and vastness of construction as yet unknown. It was not like the colossal fanes of Egypt, either rocks hewn into temples, or rocks transported and piled up into temples; or the fabrics supported on the immense monolithic pillars in the Eastern cities (which the Romans themselves in the time of the Antonines and their successors rivalled at Baalbec and Palinyra); nor yet the huge terraced masses of brickwork in the farther East. The transcendent and peculiar Architecture of the Romans was seen in their still more vast theatres and amphitheatres, which could contain thousands and thousands of spectators; in their Cæsarean palaces, which were almost

cities ; in their baths, in which the population of considerable towns, or whole quarters of Rome, found space not for bathing only, but for every kind of recreation and amusement ; in their bridges, which spanned the broadest and most turbulent rivers ; and their aqueducts, stretching out miles after miles, and conveying plentiful water to the central city. It remained only to apply this simple, universal principle. By resting not the horizontal entablature, but the succession of arches on the capitals of the pillars, the length might be infinitely drawn out ; the roof, instead of being limited in its extent by the length of the rafters, might be vaulted over and so increased enormously in width ; and finally, suspended as it were in the air, soar to any height.

Christian Architecture, when the world under Constantine became Christian, would of course begin to display itself more boldly, more ostentatiously. It would aspire to vie with the old religion in the majesty of its temples. Not but that long before it had its public sacred edifices in the East and the West. Still it would be some time before it would confront Paganism, the Paganism of centuries. It must still in vastness and outward grandeur submit to the supremacy of the ancestral temples of the city. The Basilica, too, in its ordinary form, though in its length, height, and proportions there might be a severe and serious grandeur, was plain. A high unadorned wall formed its sides, its front was unbroken but by the portals : it had not its splendid rows of external columns, with their interchanging light and shade ; nor the rich and sculptured pediment over its entrance. Constantine, before his departure to the East, erected more

Constantine
the Great.

than one church, no doubt worthy of an imperial proselyte, for the new religion of the empire. But earthquakes, conflagrations, wars, tumults, the prodigal reverence of some Popes, the vast ambition of others, have left not a vestige of the Constantinian buildings in Rome. The Church of the Lateran, thrown down by an earthquake, was rebuilt by Sergius III. That built in honor of St. Peter¹ (it was asserted and believed over the place of his martyrdom), with its splendid fore-court and its five aisles, which to the time of Charlemagne, though the prodigal piety of some Popes had no doubt violated its original, it should seem, almost cruciform, outline, and sheathed its walls in gold and precious marbles; yet maintained the plan and distribution of the old church. It stood, notwithstanding the ravages of the Saracens, the sieges of the Emperors, the seditions of the people, on its primitive Constantinian site for many hundred years after, and was only swept away by the irreverent haughtiness of Julius II., to make way for what was expected to, and which does, command the universal wonder of mankind, the St. Peter's of Bramante and Michael Angelo. The noble church of St. Paul, without the walls, built by Theodosius the Great, stood as it were the one majestic representative of the Imperial Christian Basilica till our own days.² The ground-plan of the Basilica must be sought in the humbler Church of St. Clemente,³ which alone retains it in its integrity: St.

¹ On the old St. Peter's, see the curious work of Bonanni, *Historia Templi Vaticani* (Rome, 1706), and the elaborate chapter in Bunsen and Platter, *Röm's Beschreibung*.

² The author saw this stately and venerable building in the summer of 1822: it was burned down in the autumn of that year.

³ See the St. Clemente in Mr. Gally Knight's splendid and munificent

Maria Maggiore, St. Lorenzo, and one or two others, have been so overlaid with alterations as only to reveal to the most patient study distinct signs of their original structure.

Constantinople rose a Christian city, but a Christian city probably in most parts built by Roman hands, or by Greeks with full command of Roman skill and science, and studiously aspired to be an eastern Rome. As her Senators, her Patricians, so probably many of her architects and artists came from Rome; or if Greeks, were instructed and willing to conform to Roman habits and usage. The courtiers of Constantinople, who migrated from the old to the new Rome, were surprised, it is said, to find palaces so closely resembling their own, that they hardly believed themselves to have been transported from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Bosphorus. Constantine himself was a Western by birth and education; Rome therefore rather than the East would furnish the first model for the Christian Churches. In old Byzantium there were probably few temples of such magnificence as to tempt the Christians to usurp them for their own uses, or allure them to the imitation of their forms. Nor did such temples, dilapidated and deserted, as in later times in Rome and Italy, furnish inexhaustible quarries from which triumphant Christianity might seize and carry off her legitimate spoils. There were not at hand rows of noble pillars, already hewn, fluted or polished, with their bases and capitals, which, accustomed to form the porch, or to flank the heathen temple, now took their stand along the nave of the church,

work; which has the rare excellence, that the beauty of the engravings does not interfere with their scrupulous accuracy.

or before the majestic vestibule. Though Constantine largely plundered other works of art, statues of bronze or marble (somewhat incongruous heathen ornaments of a Christian city), yet he can have had no great quantity of materials from old temples, unless at much cost of freight from more remote cities, to work up in his churches.¹ On the other hand neither were there many, if there was a single Basilica, such as were found in most Italian cities, ready to undergo the slight necessary transmutation. Yet there can be no doubt that the first churches in Constantinople were in the Basilican form; that St. Sophia was of an oblong shape there is satisfactory authority; it was not till the reign of Constantius that the area was enlarged to a square.²

This, then, which may be called the Roman or Basilican, may be considered as the first Age of Christian Architecture.

II. Of true Byzantine Architecture Justinian was the parent. Time, earthquakes, seditions nowhere so furious and destructive as in Constantinople, especially the famous one in the reign of Justinian; more ambitious or more prodigal Emperors, or more devout and wealthy Christians, denied duration to the primitive

¹ See Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 409.

² It was of great length, *δρόμικος* the form of a Dromos, or Circus for races. See Ducange, *Descriptio S. Sophiæ*; and also on the enlargement by Constantius. The Church in the Blachernæ, built so late as Justin, had straight rows of pillars and a timber roof. The Church of S. John Studius, still existing, is of the basilican form of that period. — Schnaase, *Geschichte der Bildenden Kunst*, iii. p. 123, note. On the other hand the Church of Antioch, described by Eusebius and by Theophilus, was an octagon, as was that of Nazianzum. — Schnaase, p. 124. The round form, not unknown in the East, nor in the West, as that of St. Constanza near Rome, was more used for Baptisteries, and for monumental chapels, as the tomb of Galla Placidia at Ravenna.

Churches of Constantinople. The edifices of Constantine, in all likelihood hastily run up, and, if splendid, wanting in strength and solidity, gave place to more stately and enduring churches. The St. Sophia of Constantine was razed to the ground in a fierce tumult; but on its site arose the new St. Sophia, in the East the pride, in the West the wonder, of the world.¹ The sublime unity and harmony of the design, above all the lightness and vastness of the cupola, were too marvellous for mere human science. Even the skill of the famous architects Anthimus of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus were unequal to the conception. An angel revealed to the Emperor (Justinian himself must share in the glory) many of the forms of the building; the great principle of the construction of the cupola, sought in vain by the science of the architects, flashed across the mind of the Emperor himself in a dream. The cupola did not seem, according to the historian Procopius, to rest on its supports, but to be let down by a golden chain from heaven.² Santa Sophia was proclaimed in the West as the most consummate work of Christian Architecture.³

¹ To the poem of Paulus Silentarius, on the building and dedication of St. Sophia (Edition Bonn), are appended the laborious dissertation of Ducange, and the perspicuous illustrative essay of Banduri. They contain everything relating to the structure.

² τούτου δὲ τοῦ κυκλοτεροῦς παμμεγέθους ἐπαναστηκυῖα τις σφαιροειδὲς θόλος ποιῆται, αὐτὸ διαφερόντως εὐπρόσωπον· δοκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ στερρῷ τῆς οἰκοδομίας διὰ τὸ παρεμμένον τῆς οἰκοδομίας ἐστάναι, ἀλλὰ τῇ σειρῇ τῇ χρυσῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξημμένη καλύπτειν τὸν χώρον. — Procop. de *Ædific.* i. p. 177, Edit. Bonn.

³ "Cujus opus adeo cuncta ædificia excellit ut in totis terrarum spatibus huic simile non possit inveniri." — Paul Warnefrid. St. Sophia and some other Constantinopolitan churches have become better known during the last year (1854) from the splendid work published by M. Salzenberg, at the expense of the King of Prussia. An Italian architect, M. Fossato, having

But Justinian was not content to be the founder and lawgiver of Christian art; as in empire, so he aspired in all things, to bring the whole Roman world under his dominion. To conquered Italy he brought back the vast code of the Civil Law, which he had organized and adapted to Christian use; to Italy came also his architecture, an immense amplification of the Roman arch, which was to be, if not the law, the perfect form of the Christian Church. San Vitale arose in Ravenna, the Constantinople of the West. In dimensions only and in the gorgeousness of some of its materials, San Vitale must bow before its Byzantine type Santa Sophia, but it closely resembled it in plan and arrangement. The Mosaics of the Emperor and of the Empress Theodora in the choir might seem as though they would commend San Vitale as the perfect design for a Christian Church to subject Italy and to the West. Rome indeed might seem, even in Ravenna, to offer a more gallant resistance to the arts than to the arms of Justinian. To San Vitale she would oppose the noble St. Apollinaris, in her own basilican form. Of the ancient basilicas, since the destruction of St. Paul without the walls at Rome, St. Apollinaris at Ravenna, with its twenty-four columns of rich Greek marble from Constantinople, and its superb mosaics, is undoubtedly the most impressive and august in the world.¹

Thus, then, there were two forms which contested for the supremacy in Italy. One was the old Roman

been intrusted with the repairs, the whole structure has been surveyed, measured, and drawn. Many mosaics covered up since the transmutation into a mosque have for a time revealed again in all their brilliancy some very remarkable specimens of Byzantine mosaic art.

¹ See this church in Gally Knight.

Basilica, with its stately length, which by slow and imperceptible degrees became cruciform by the extension into transepts of the space between the end of the nave (where rose a great arch, called the Arch of Triumph, as opening upon the holy mysteries of the faith), and the conch or apse, before which stood the high altar. The other was square or octagon, which in the same manner and by the same slow process broke into the short equal-limbed Greek cross.¹ This latter form, with the cupola, was the vital distinction of the Byzantine style.² Rome remained faithful to her ancient basilican form; but in many of the cities of Northern Italy the more equal proportion of the length and width, with the central cupola, sometimes multiplied on the extended limbs of the transept; these, the only creations of Byzantine architecture, found favor. Venice early took her eastern character; the old church of St. Fosca in Torcello, in later times St. Mark's maintained the Byzantine form.³ St. Mark's, with her Greek plan, her domes, her mosaics, might seem as if she had prophetically prepared a fit and congenial place for the reception of the spoils of the Constantinopolitan Churches after the Latin conquest. But many other of the Lombard Churches, in Pavia, Parma, the old cathedral at Bres-

¹ It is not known when the form of the Cross began. Mr. Gally Knight observes that the form of the Cross was for many centuries the exception rather than the rule.

² Procopius states of St. Sophia, *εὐρος δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ μῆκος οὕτως ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ ἐπιτετορνεύεται, ὥστε καὶ περιμήκης, καὶ ὅλως εὐρεία οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου εἰρήσεται*, p. 174. — So too that of St. Mary and St. Michael, c. iii. p. 174. St. Anthimus, c. vi. p. 194. That of the Apostles was a Greek Cross, c. iii. p. 188.

³ The round churches, which were few, gave place to Baptisteries, for which or for sepulchral chapels they were mostly originally designed.

cia, were square, octagon, or in the form of the Greek cross. As late as the tenth century Ancona, still a Greek city, raised the Church of St. Cyriac, with much of what is called Lombard, more properly Romanesque ornament, but in form a strictly Byzantine Church.¹

Yet on the whole the architectural, as the civil con-
Difference of
Greek and La-
tin services.
quests of Justinian, were but partial and un-
enduring. The Latin Architecture, with these exceptions, even in Italy, adhered to the basilican form or to the longer Latin cross : beyond the Alps the square form was even more rare. But it is singular to observe in both the development of the hierarchical principle according to the character and circumstances of the Eastern and the Western Church. As the worship throughout Christendom became more local, more material, the altar was now the Holy of Holies, the actual abode of the Real Presence of Christ. The Clergy withdrew more entirely into their unapproachable sanctity ; they would shroud themselves from all profane approximation by solemn mystery, the mystery which arises from remoteness, from obscurity or dimness, or even from secrecy. For this end, to heighten the awe which he would throw around the tremendous sacrifice, and around himself the hallowed minister of that sacrifice, the Greek, in himself less awful, had recourse to artificial means. The Latin trusted to his own inherent dignity, aided only by more profound distance, by the splendor which environed

¹ It is curious that Charlemagne's cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle is the one true Byzantine church or type of a Byzantine church beyond the Alps — in form, construction, even in mosaics. Charlemagne had perhaps Greek architects, he had seen Ravenna, he drew ornaments and materials from Ravenna. Compare Schnaase, vol. xiv. 486 *et seq.*

him, splendor more effective as heightened by surrounding darkness. The shorter Greek cross did not repel the adoring worshipper far enough off; the Greek therefore drew a veil. At length he raised a kind of wall between himself and the worshippers, and behind, in that enclosed sanctuary, he performed the mystery of consecration, and came forth and showed himself in turn at each of the side-doors of the Holy of Holies, rarely at the central or royal gate, with the precious paten and chalice in his hands. When the service was over, he withdrew again with his awful treasure into its secret sanctuary.¹ In the longer Latin cross the hierarchy might recede to a commanding distance from the great mass of worshippers, yet all might remain open; the light rails of the chancel were sufficient, with their own inherent majesty, to keep the profane on their lower level, and in their humble posture of far-off adoration. In the West the crypt under the altar, to contain the bones of the saint or martyr, was more general; the altar therefore was more usually approached by a flight of steps, and thus elevation was added to distance: and to distance and elevation were added by degrees the more dazzling splendor of the altar-furniture, the crosses, the candlesticks, the plate, the censers, and all the other gorgeous vessels, their own dresses, the violet, green, scarlet, cloth of gold, the blaze of lamps and tapers, the clouds of incense. At one time the altar and the officiating clergy were wrapped in the mystery of sublime gloom, at the next the whole altar, and all un-

¹ Smith's account of the Greek Church, p. 64. This, called the *Iconostasis*, is general in the Russian churches. There is a curious example at Pesth in Hungary.

der the stately Baldachin, burst out into a concentrated brilliancy of light. The greater length of the building, with its succursal aisles and ambulatories and chapels, as so admirably adapted for processional services, would greatly promote their introduction and use. The Clergy would no longer be content with dim and distant awe and veneration; this was now inherent in their persons: and so, environed with their sacred symbols, bearing their banners emblazoned with the image of the crucified Redeemer, of the Virgin, of the Saints, and the crosses, the emblems of their own authority and power, and in their snow-white or gorgeous dresses, they would pass through the rows of wondering and kneeling worshippers, with their grave and solemn chant, or amid the peals of the thundering organ, bringing home, as it were, to the hearts of all, the most serious religious impressions, as well as those of their own peculiar inalienable sanctity.

But the oppugnancy was not only in the internal form and arrangements of the sacred buildings or the more effective display of ecclesiastic magnificence. In splendor of dress, in the richness of their church furniture and vessels, in the mysterious symbolism of their services, the East boasted itself even superior to the West. But the more vigorously developed hierarchical spirit among the Latins displayed itself in nothing more than in its creativeness, in its progressive advancement in Christian Architecture. The Emperors were in general the founders and builders of the great Eastern Churches, in the West to a vast extent the Church herself. Though kings and nobles were by no means wanting in these signs of prodigal piety — the Catholic

Lombard kings, the priest-ruled Merovingians, Charlemagne and his descendants, the sovereigns in England—there were also, besides these royal and noble devotees, the magnificent Prelates, the splendid Abbots, the opulent Chapters. In the East it was the State acting it might be under the influence, in obedience to, or at the suggestion of the Priesthood; in the West with the Monarch and the Baron, it was the whole ecclesiastical Order out of its own enormous wealth, its own vast possessions, and still accumulating property. From the seventh at least to the close of the fourteenth century this wealth was steadily on the increase, at times pouring in like a flood; if draining off, draining but in narrow and secret channels. It was in the nature of things that a large portion of this wealth should be consecrated, above all others, to this special use. It had long been admitted that a fifth, a fourth, a third of the ecclesiastical endowments belonged to the sustentation, to the embellishment of the religious fabrics. But it needed no law to enforce on a wide scale this expenditure demanded at once by every holy and generous principle, by every ambitious among the more far-sighted and politic, as well as by every more sordid, motive. Throughout Christendom there was the high and pure, as well as the timid and superstitious religion, which invited, encouraged, commanded, exacted, promised to reward in this world and in the next, these noble works of piety. Without as within the Church these motives were in perpetual, unslumbering activity. Church-building was, as it were, the visible personal sacrifice to God, a sacrifice which could never be fully accomplished; it was the grateful or expiatory oblation to the Redeemer and to

the Saints. The dying king, the dying noble, the dying rich man, or the king, noble, or rich man, under strong remorse during his lifetime, might with more lofty and disinterested urgency be pressed by the priest or the confessor to make the bequest or the gift to a holy work in which the clergy had no direct advantage, and which was in some sort a splendid public benefaction. The Church was built for the poor, for the people, for posterity. What the splendor of the old Asiatic monarchs had done for the perpetuation of their own luxury and glory, the Egyptians for their burying-places, as well as in honor of their gods; what the narrower patriotism of the Greeks for the embellishment of their own cities, for the comfort and enjoyment of the citizens: what the stern pride of the older, the enormous wealth and ostentation of the later republicans at Rome; what the Pagan Emperors had done, the elder Cæsars to command the wonder, gratitude, adulation of the mistress of the world; Trajan, Hadrian, the Antonines, from policy, vanity, beneficence, on a wider and more cosmopolitan scale throughout the Empire: what had been thus done in many various ways, was now done by most kings and most rich men in one way alone.¹ Besides temples the heathen Cæsars had raised palaces, theatres, amphitheatres, circuses, baths, roads, bridges, aqueducts, senate-houses, porticos, libraries, cemeteries. Now the only public buildings, unless here and there a bridge (until the burghers in the commercial cities

¹ Let it be remembered that in Paris, in the time of Philip the Fair, the house of the Templars was stronger if not more magnificent than the King's palace in the Louvre. What in comparison were the more sumptuous religious buildings?

began to raise their guildhalls) were the church and the castle. The castle was built more for strength than for splendor. Architecture had the Church alone and her adjacent buildings on which to lavish all her skill, and to expend the inexhaustible treasures poured at her feet. To build the Church was admitted at once as the most admirable virtue, as the most uncontested sign of piety, as the fullest atonement for sin, as the amplest restitution for robbery or wrong, as the bounden tribute of the loyal subject of God, as the most unquestioned recognition of the sovereignty and mercy of God.

If these incentives were forever working without the Church, besides these, what powerful concur- <sup>Incentives
for Church
buildings.</sup> rent and subsidiary motives were in action within the Church! Every Prelate, even each member of a Chapter (if he had any noble or less sordid feeling than personal indulgence in pomp and luxury, or the least ecclesiastical public spirit), would feel emulation of his spiritual ancestors: he would delight to put to shame the less prodigal, the more parsimonious, generosity of his predecessor, would endeavor to transcend him in the richness of his oblation to God or to the Patron Saint. He would throw down that predecessor's meaner work, and replace it by something more splendid and enduring. Posthumous glory would assume a sacred character: the Prelate would not be inflexibly and humbly content with obscure goodness, or with the unwitnessed virtues, which would rest entirely on the reward in the world to come. The best and wisest might think that if their names lived on earth with their imperishable Cathedrals, it was a pardonable, if not a pious and laudable ambition.

Their own desire of glory would so mingle with what they esteemed the glory of God, as to baffle their discrimination. So too national, municipal, corporate, local pride and interest would disguise themselves as the love of God and man. The fane of some tutelary saint, or some shrine of peculiar holiness or of wonder-working power, which attracted more numerous and more devout pilgrims, as it enriched the Church, the city, the town, the village, so it would demand even from gratitude a larger share of the votive offerings. The Saint must be rewarded for his favors, for his benefits; his church, his chapel, and his shrine must be more splendid, as more splendid would be more attractive; and thus splendor would beget wealth, wealth gladly devote itself to augment the splendor.

Throughout, indeed, there was this latent, and unconscious it might be, but undeniable influence operating through the whole sacerdotal Order, through the whole Monkhood, and not less among the more humble Friars. Every church was not merely the house of God, it was also the palace where the religious Sovereign, the Ecclesiastic, from the Pope to the lowliest Parish Priest, held his state; it was the unassailable fortress of his power; it was, I use the word with reluctance, the Exchange where, by the display of his wealth, he immeasurably increased that wealth. To the Ecclesiastic belonged the chancel, not to be entered by unsanctified feet; to him in his solitary or in his corporate dignity, only attended by a retinue of his own order; his were the costly dresses, the clouds of incense. The more magnificent the church, and the more sumptuous the services, the

broader the line which divided him from the vulgar, the rest of mankind. If he vouchsafed some distinction, some approach towards his unapproachable majesty, as when the Emperor took his seat at the entrance or within the chancel, read the Gospel, and was graciously permitted to perform some of the functions of a Deacon, this but threw back the rest of mankind to more humble distance. Those passages which the haughtiest Popes alleged in plain words, as "Ye are Gods," which was generally read, "Ye are Christs (the anointed of God)," almost revoked, or neutralized in the minds of the Priesthood, the specious reservation that it was God in them, and not themselves, which received these honors. Popular awe and reverence know no nice theological discrimination; at least a large share of the veneration to the Saint or the Redeemer, to God, rested, as it passed, on the Hierarchy. They were recognized as those without whose mediation no prayer passed onward to the throne of grace; they stood on a step, often a wide step, higher in the ascent to heaven. Everywhere, through the whole framework of society, was this contrast, and the contrast was to the advantage of the Hierarchy. The highest and richest Bishop in his episcopal palace might see the castle of the Baron not only in its strength, but in its height, its domains, its feudal splendor, its castellated richness, frowning contemptuously down upon him; he might seem to be lurking, as it were, a humble retainer under its shadow and under its protection. But enter the church! the Baron stood afar off, or knelt in submissive, acknowledged, infelt inferiority; and it was seldom that in the city the cathedral did not outsoar and outspread with its dependent buildings —

its baptistery, chapter-house, belfry, cloisters — the rival castle with all its outbuildings. That which in the cathedral city long held the Ecclesiastics in their separate peculiar majesty, went down in due proportion through the town to the village, to the meanest hamlet. In the feudal castle itself the chapel was almost always the most richly decorated. During war, in the siege, in the boisterous banquet, the chaplain might be self-levelled, or levelled by a lawless chief and lawless soldiery, to a humble retainer ; in the chapel he resumed his proper dignity. It was his fault, his want of influence, if the chapel was not maintained in greater decency and splendor than the rude hall or ruder chamber ; and reverence to the chapel reacted on the reverence to himself.

Add to all this the churches or chapels of the religious houses, and there was hardly a religious house without its church or chapel, many of them equal or surpassing in grandeur, in embellishment, those of the town or of the city. In a religious foundation the Church could not, for very shame, be less than the most stately and the most splendid edifice. Year after year, century after century, if any part of the monastery was secure from dilapidation, if any part was maintained, rebuilt, redecorated, it would be the church. The vow of humility, the vow of poverty was first tacitly violated, first disdainfully thrown aside, by the severest Order, in honor of God. The sackcloth-clad, barefoot Friar would watch and worship on the cold stone or the hard board ; but within walls enriched with the noblest paintings, tapestried with the most superb hangings, before an altar flashing with the gold pyx, with the jewelled vessels, with the rich

branching candlesticks. Assisi, not many years after the death of St. Francis, had begun to be the most splendid and highly adorned church in Italy.

Thus then architecture was the minister at once and servant of the Church, and a vast proportion of the wealth of the world was devoted ^{The Church} ^{the people's.} to the works of architecture. Nor was it in a secular point of view a wasteful pomp and prodigality. If the church was the one building of the priest, so was it of the people. It was the single safe and quiet place where the lowest of the low found security, peace, rest, recreation, even diversion. If the chancel was the Priest's, the precincts, the porch, the nave were open to all; the Church was all which the amphitheatre, the bath, the portico, the public place, had been to the poor in the heathen cities. It was more than the house of prayer and worship, where the peasant or the beggar knelt side by side with the burgher or the Baron; it was the asylum, not of the criminal only, but of the oppressed, the sad, the toilworn, the infirm, the aged. It was not only dedicated to God; it was consecrated to the consolation, the peace, even the enjoyment of man. Thus was it that architecture was raising all its wondrous structures in the West, if for the advancement of the Hierarchy, so too at the perpetual unsleeping instigation, at the cost, and it should seem under the special direction, of the Hierarchy: for no doubt within the precincts of the cathedral, within the cloister, much of the science of architecture was preserved, perpetuated, enlarged; if the architects were not themselves Ecclesiastics, they were under the protection, patronage, direction, instruction of Ecclesiastics. But it was also of the most indubitable benefit to mankind.

Independent of the elevating, solemnizing, expanding effects of this most material and therefore most universally impressive of the Fine Arts, what was it to all mankind, especially to the prostrate and down-trodden part of mankind, that though these buildings were God's, they were, in a certain sense, his own; he who had no property, not even in his own person, the serf, the villain, had a kind of right of proprietorship in his parish church, the meanest artisan in his cathedral. It is impossible to follow out to their utmost extent, or to appreciate too highly the ennobling, liberalizing, humanizing, Christianizing effects of church architecture during the Middle Ages.

III. The third period of Christian architecture (reckoning as the first the Roman Basilica, as the second the proper Byzantine, with its distinctive Greek cross and cupolas) lasted with the Norman till the introduction of the Pointed or so-called Gothic in the twelfth century. This style has been called Lombard, as having first flourished in the cities of Northern Italy, which under the later Kings attained unwonted peace and prosperity, and in which the cities rose to industry, commerce, wealth, and freedom. Assuredly it was no invention of the rude Lombards, who brought over the Alps only their conquering arms and their hated Arianism. It has been called also Byzantine, improperly, for though it admitted indiscriminately Byzantine and Roman forms and arrangements, its characteristics seem either its own or the traditions of Roman principles, the appropriation and conversion to its use of Roman examples. Its chief characteristic is delight in the multiplication of the arch, not only for the support, but for the

Third style.
Lombard,
Byzantine, or
Romanesque.

ornamentation of the building. Within and without there is the same prodigality of this form. But these rows or tiers of arches, without supporting or seeming to support the roof, or simply decorative, appear to be no more than the degenerate Roman, as seen in the Palace of Dioclesian at Spalatro, and usefully as well as ornamentally employed in the Coliseum and in other amphitheatres. Gradually the west front of the Church, or the front opposite to the altar, grew into dignity and importance. The central portal, sometimes the three portals, or even five portals, lost their square-headed form, became receding arches, arches within arches, decorated with graceful or fantastic mouldings. Above, tier over tier, were formed rows of arches (unless where a rich wheel or rose window was introduced) up to the broad bold gable, which was sometimes fringed as it were just below with small arches following out its line. Sometimes these arches ran along the side walls; almost always either standing out more or less, or in open arcades, they ran round the semicircular eastern apse. Besides these, slender compound piers or small buttresses are carried up the whole height to the eaves. They arrive at length at the severer model of this form, San Zeno at Verona, or the richer, the San Michele at Lucca. Within the church the pillars, as the models of those in the ancient buildings disappeared (the Roman Corinthian long survived), or rather as the ruins of ancient buildings ceased to be the quarries for churches, gradually lost their capitals. From those sprung the round arches in a bolder or more timid sweep, according to the distance or solidity of the pillars. Above the nave a second row of arches formed the clear-story windows. The

roof, in general of timber, was first flat, then curved, at length vaulted. Over the centre of the cross rose the cupola, round, octagon, or of more fanciful forms. In the seventh century the introduction of bells, to summon to the service, drew on the invention of the architect. The dome or cupola was not a convenient form for a belfry. Beside the building it had not been unusual to erect a baptistery, circular or polygonal, such as are still seen in the richest form, and almost rivalling the churches, in Florence and in Parma. Throughout Lombardy, in most parts of Italy, rose the detached campanile, sometimes round, in general square, terminating at times with a broad flat roof, more rarely towering into a spire. In Italy this third epoch of architecture culminated in the Cathedral of Pisa. It was the oblation of the richest and most powerful city in Italy, at the height of her prosperity, her industry, her commerce, her fame; it was made in the pride of her wealth, in a passion of gratitude for a victory and for rich plunder taken from the Mohammedans in the harbor of Palermo. Pisa found an architect worthy of her profuse magnificence; the name of Boscheto lives in this his unrivalled edifice. It is not only that the cathedral makes one of those four buildings — the Dome, the Baptistery, the Leaning Tower, the Campo Santo — which in their sad grandeur in the deserted city surpass all other groups of buildings in Europe: the cathedral standing alone would command the highest admiration. On the exterior the west front displays that profusion of tiers of arches above arches, arranged with finer proportion, richness, and upward decreasing order, than elsewhere. But its sublimity is within. Its plan, the Latin cross

in the most perfect proportion, gives its impressive unity to its central nave, with its double aisles, its aisled transepts, its receding apse. Its loftiness is far more commanding than any building of its class in Italy had as yet aspired to reach. The Corinthian pillars along the nave are of admirable height and proportion;¹ those of the aisles lower, but of the same style. The arches spring boldly from the capitals of the pillars; the triforium above, running down the long nave, is singularly picturesque. While the long, bold, horizontal architrave gives the sedate regularity of the Basilica; the crossings of the transepts, the sweep of the curved apse, even without the effective mosaic of Cimabue, close the view with lines of the most felicitous and noble form.

Nothing can contrast more strongly, in the same architecture, than the Transalpine Romanesque with Pisa.² It is seen in all the old cities on the Rhine (the earliest form in St. Castor at Coblentz), later at Spires, Worms, Mentz, Bonn, the older churches at Cologne; east of the Rhine in the older cities or monasteries, as in Corvey. It is more rude but more bold; these churches might seem the works of the great feudal Prelates; with a severe grandeur, not without richness of decoration, but disdaining grace or luxuriance. They are of vast size, as may beseem Prelate Princes, but of the coarse red or gray stone of the country, no fine-wrought freestone, no glittering marble. The pillars are usually without capitals, or with capitals fantastic and roughly hewn; they would impress by strength and solidity rather than by

¹ The pointed arch from the nave to the transepts is of later date; incongruous but not without effect.

² See for the Saxon Romanesque Schnaase.

harmony or regularity.¹ In the south of France this style is traced not only in cathedral cities, but in many very curious parochial churches. With few exceptions, it is there more picturesque and fanciful than grand or solemn. In the north of France and in England this architecture received such a powerful impulse from the Normans as almost to form a new epoch in the art.

IV. That wonderful people, the Normans, though
The Nor- without creative power, seemed as it were to
 throw their whole strength and vigor into architecture, as into everything else. They had their kingdoms on the Mediterranean, and on either side of the British Channel. In the South they had become Southern; even in architecture they anticipated from the Mohammedans some approximation to the Gothic, the pointed arch. In the North, on the other hand, as by adopting and domiciling men of Roman or Italian cultivation, they had braced the intellect of the degenerate Church to young energy, and had trained learned Churchmen and theologians, Lanfrancs and Anselms; so taking the form, the structure, the architectural science of universal Latin Christendom, they gave it a grandeur, solidity, massiveness, even height, which might seem intended to confront a ruder element, more wild and tempestuous weather. The Norman cathedrals might almost seem built for warlike or defensive purposes; as though their Heathen ancestors, having in their fierce incursions destroyed church and monastery, as well as castle and town, they would be prepared for any inroad of yet un-Christianized Northmen. That great characteristic of the Norman churches, the huge square central tower, was battlemented like a castle.

¹ Mr. Petit has published engravings of many of these buildings.

The whole impression is that of vast power in the architect, unshaken duration in the edifice; it is the building of a Hierarchy which has unfailing confidence in its own strength, in its perpetuity. On the exterior, in the general design there is plainness, almost austerity; the walls, visibly of enormous thickness, are pierced with round arched windows of no great size, but of great depth; the portals are profound recesses, arch within arch resting on short stubborn pillars; the capitals are rude, but boldly projecting; the rich ornaments cut with a vigorous and decisive hand: the zigzag or other mouldings with severity in their most prodigal richness. In the interior all again is simple to the disdain, in its greater parts, of ornament. The low, thick, usually round pillars, with capitals sometimes indulging in wild shapes, support, with their somewhat low arches, the ponderous wall, in its turn pressed down as it were by the ponderous roof. Such are the works of our Norman Kings, the two abbeys at Caen, Jumieges in its ruins, St. George de Boscherville; such in our island, Durham, parts of Peterborough and Ely, and Gloucester, the two square towers of Exeter. If later and more splendid cathedrals inspire a higher devotion, none breathe more awe and solemnity than the old Norman.¹

V. On a sudden, in a singularly short period, the latter half of the twelfth century (though discerning ^{Gothic archi-} eyes² may trace, and acute minds have traced ^{tecture.} with remarkable success and felicity, this transition),

¹ See Mr. Gally Knight's Norman Tour, and Normans in Sicily. Mr. Knight dedicated part of a noble fortune to these studies, illustrating his own excellent judgment by the well-remunerated labors of accomplished artists.

² Dr. Whewell, Mr. Willis, Mr. Petit.

Christian architecture beyond the Alps, in Germany, in France, in England, becomes creative. Nothing but the distribution and arrangement of the parts of the church remains the same; and even in that respect the church, instead of standing alone or nearly alone, with the other edifices in humble subordination, is crowded around by a multitude of splendid vassals, partaking in all her decorative richness, the Lady chapel and other chapels, the chapter-house, the monastery, the episcopal palace, the cloisters, sometimes the belfry.

In the church not only are there new forms, not only is there a new principle of harmony, not only a constant substitution of vertical for horizontal lines, new and most exquisite proportions, an absolutely original character, but new principles of construction seem to have revealed themselves. Architecture is not only a new art, awakening different emotions of wonder, awe and admiration, but a new science. It has discovered the secret of achieving things which might appear impossible, but which once achieved, seem perfectly simple, secure, justificatory of their boldness, from the perfect balance and equable pressure of every part, pressure disguised as it were, as distributed on a multitude of supports, and locked down by superincumbent weights. Such is the unity, however multifarious, of the whole, that the lightest, though loftiest and most vast Gothic cathedral, has a look of strength and duration as manifest, as unquestioned, as the most ponderous and massive Romanesque or Norman.

The rapid, simultaneous, and universal growth of this so-called Gothic, its predominance, like its predecessor the Romanesque, through the whole realm of Latin Christendom, is not the least ex-

Rapid rise
and extension.

traordinary fact in the revolution. It has had marked stages of development (now defined with careful discrimination by the able and prolific writers on the art) during several centuries and in all countries, in Germany, France, England, the Netherlands, Spain, even Italy; but its first principles might almost seem to have broken at once on the wondering world. Everywhere the whole building has an upward, it might seem heaven-aspiring tendency; everywhere the arches become more and more pointed, till at length they arrive at the perfect lancet; everywhere the thick and massy walls expand into large mullioned windows; everywhere the diminished solidity of the walls is supported from without by flying buttresses, now concealed, now become lighter and more graceful, and revealing themselves, not as mere supports, but as integral parts of the building, and resting on outward buttresses; everywhere pinnacles arise, singly or in clusters, not for ornament alone, but for effect and perceptible use; everywhere the roof becomes a ridge more or less precipitate; everywhere the west front becomes more rich and elaborate, with its receding portals covered with niches, which are crowded with statues; everywhere the central tower assumes a more graceful form, or tapers into a spire; often two subordinate towers, or two principal towers, flank the west front; everywhere, in the exuberant prodigality of ornament, knosps, shrine-work, corbels, gargoyles, there is a significance and a purport. Within the church the pillars along the nave break into graceful clusters around the central shaft; the vaulted roof is formed of the most simple yet intricate ribs; everywhere there are the noblest avenues of straight lines of pillars, the most picturesque cross-

ings and interminglings of arches; everywhere harmony of the same converging lines; everywhere the aim appears to be height, unity of impression, with infinite variety of parts; a kind of heavenward aspiration, with the most prodigal display of human labor and wealth, as an oblation to the temple of God.

The rise of Gothic Architecture, loosely speaking, was contemporaneous with the Crusades.¹ It was natural to suppose that the eyes of the pilgrims were

The Cru-
sades. caught by the slender, graceful, and richly decorated forms of the Saracenic mosques, with their minarets and turrets. Pointed windows were discovered in mosques, and held to be the models of the Gothic cathedrals. Even earlier, when the Normans were piling up their massy round arches in the North, they had some pointed arches in Sicily, apparently adopted from the Mohammedans of that island.² But the pointed arch is only one characteristic of Gothic Architecture, it is a vast step from the imitation of a pointed arch or window (if there were such imitation, which is extremely doubtful), to the creation of a Gothic cathedral.³ The connection of the Crusades was of another kind, and far more powerful; it was the devotion aroused in all orders by that universal

¹ The theory of Warburton deriving the Gothic Cathedrals from an imitation of the overarching forests of the ancient Germans (he is disposed to go back to the Druids) is curious as illustrating the strange and total neglect of Mediæval Church History in this country. Here is a divine of almost unrivalled erudition (Jortin excepted) in his day, who seems to suppose that the Germans immediately that they emerged from their forests, set to work to build Gothic cathedrals. He must either have supposed Gothic architecture of the fourth or fifth century, or quietly annihilated the intervening centuries to the twelfth.

² Gally Knight, "Normans in Sicily."

³ Compare Whewell, "Architectural Notes," p. 85.

movement, which set into activity all the faculties of man ; and the riches poured into the lap of the Clergy, which enabled them to achieve such wonders in so short a period. Religion awoke creative genius, genius worked freely with boundless command of wealth.

This apparently simultaneous outburst, and the universal promulgation of the principles, rules, ^{Theory of} and practice of the Gothic Architecture, has ^{Guild of} ^{Freemasons.} been accounted for by the existence of a vast secret guild of Freemasons, or of architects.¹ Of this guild, either connected with or latent in the monasteries and among the Clergy, some of whom were men of profound architectural science, and held in their pay and in their subservience all who were not ecclesiastics, it is said, the centre, the quickening, and governing power was in Rome. Certainly of all developments of the Papal influence and wisdom none could be more extraordinary than this summoning into being, this conception, this completion of these marvellous buildings in every part of Latin Christendom. But it is fatal to this theory that Rome is the city in which Gothic Architecture, which some have strangely called the one absolute and exclusive Christian Architecture, has never found its place ; even in Italy it has at no time been more than a half-naturalized stranger. It must be supposed that while the Papacy was thus planting the world with Gothic cathedrals, this was but a sort of lofty concession to Transalpine barbarism, while itself adhered to the ancient, venerable, more true and majestic style of ancient Rome. This guild too was so secret as to elude all discovery. History, documentary evidence maintain rigid, inexplicable silence. The ac-

¹ Hope on Architecture.

counts, which in some places have been found, name persons employed. The names of one or two architects, as Erwin of Strasburg, have survived, but of this guild not one word.¹ The theory is not less unnecessary than without support. Undoubtedly there was the great universal guild, the Clergy and the monastic bodies, who perhaps produced, certainly retained, employed, guided, directed the builders. During this period Latin Christendom was in a state of perpetual movement, intercommunication between all parts was frequent, easy, uninterrupted. There were not only now pilgrimages to Rome, but a regular tide setting to and from the East, a concourse to the schools and universities, to Paris, Cologne, Montpellier, Bologna, Salerno: rather later spread the Mendicants. The monasteries were the great caravansaries; every class of society was stirred to its depths; in some cases even the villains broke the bonds which attached them to the soil; to all the abbey or the church opened its hospitable gates. Men skilled and practised in the science of architecture would not rest unemployed, or but poorly employed, at home. Splendid prizes would draw forth competition, emulation. Sacerdotal prodigality, magnificence, zeal, rivalry would abroad be famous, attractive at home; they would be above local or national prepossessions. The prelate or the abbot, who had deter-

¹ All the documentary evidence adduced by Mr. Hope amounts to a Papal privilege to certain builders or masons, or a guild of builders, at Como, published by Muratori (Como was long celebrated for its skill and devotion to the art), and a charter to certain painters by our Henry VI. Schnaase (*Geschichte der Bildende Kunst*, iv. c. 5) examines and rejects the theory. He cites some few instances more of guilds, but local and municipal. The first guild of masons, which comprehended all Germany, was of the middle of the 15th century.

mined in his holy ambition that his cathedral or his abbey should surpass others, and who had unlimited wealth at his disposal, would welcome the celebrated, encourage the promising, builder from whatever quarter of Christendom he came. Thus, within certain limits, great architects would be the architects of the world, or what was then the Western world, Latin Christendom: and so there would be perpetual progress, communication, sympathy in actual design and execution, as well as in the principles and in the science of construction. Accordingly, foreign architects are frequently heard of. Germans crossed the Alps to teach Italy the secret of the new architecture.¹ Each nation indeed seems to have worked out its own Gothic with certain general peculiarities, Germany, France, the Netherlands, England, and later Spain. All seem to aim at certain effects, all recognized certain broad principles, but the application of these principles varies infinitely. Sometimes a single building, sometimes the buildings within a certain district, have their peculiarities. Under a guild, if there had been full freedom for invention, originality, boldness of design, there had been more rigid uniformity, more close adherence to rule in the scientific and technical parts.

The name of Gothic has ascended from its primal meaning, that of utter contempt, to the highest honor; it is become conventional for the architecture of the

¹ "All countries, in adopting a neighboring style, seem however to have worked it with some peculiarities of their own, so that a person conversant with examples can tell, upon inspecting a building, not only to what period it belongs, but to what nation. Much depends on material, much on the style of sculpture," &c. — Willis on Architecture, p. 11. Mr. Rickman's book is most instructive on the three styles predominant successively in England. — Compare Whewell.

Middle Ages, and commands a kind of traditionary reverence. Perhaps Teutonic, or at least Transalpine, might be a more fit appellation. It was born, and reached its maturity and perfection north of the Alps. Gothic, properly so called, is a stranger and an alien in Italy. Rome absolutely repudiated it. It was brought across the Alps by German architects; it has ever borne in Italy the somewhat contemptuous name German-Gothic.¹ Among its earliest Italian efforts is one remarkable for its history, as built by a French architect with English gold, and endowed with benefices in England. The Cardinal Gualo, the legate who placed the young Henry III. on the throne of England, as he came back laden with the grateful or extorted tribute of the island, 12,000 marks of silver, encountered an architect of fame at Paris: he carried the Northern

Italian Gothic.
A.D. 1218. with him to his native Vercelli, where the Church of St. Andrea astonished Italy with its pointed arches, as well as the Italian clergy with the charges fixed for their maintenance on Preferments in remote England.² Assisi, for its age the wonder of the world, was built by a German architect. What is called the Lombard or Italian-Gothic, though inharmonious as attempting to reconcile vertical and horizontal lines, has no doubt its own admirable excellences, in some respects may vie with the Transalpine. Its costly marbles, inlaid into the building, where they do not become alternate layers of black and white (to my judgment an utter defiance of every sound principle of architectural effect), its gorgeousness at Florence, Sienna, its fantastic grace at Orvieto, cannot but

¹ Götico Tedesco. Compare Hope, c. xxxix.

² Compare on Cardinal Gualo, vol. v. p. 318.

awaken those emotions which are the world's recognition of noble architecture.¹ Milan to me, with all its matchless splendor, and without considering the architectural heresy of its modern west front, is wanting in religiousness. It aspires to magnificence, and nothing beyond magnificence. It is a cathedral which might have been erected in the pride of their wealth by the godless Visconti. Nothing can be more wonderful, nothing more graceful, each seen singly, than the numbers numberless, in Milton's words, of the turrets, pinnacles, statues, above, below, before, behind, on every side. But the effect is confusion, a dazzling the eyes and mind, distraction, bewilderment. The statues are a host of visible images basking in the sunshine, not glorified saints calmly ascending to heaven. In the interior the vast height is concealed and diminished by the shrine-work which a great way up arrests the eye and prevents it from following the columns up to the roof, and makes a second stage between the pavement and the vault; a decoration without meaning or purport.

There can be no doubt that the birthplace of true Gothic Architecture was north of the Alps; it should seem on the Rhine, or in those provinces of France

¹ Professor Willis lays down "that there is in fact no genuine Gothic building in Italy." — *On Italian Architecture*, p. 4. He is inclined to make exceptions for some churches built in or near Naples by the Angevine dynasty. "The curious result is a style in which the horizontal and vertical lines equally predominate; and which, while it wants alike the lateral extension and repose of the Grecian and the lofty upward tendency and pyramidal majesty of the Gothic, is yet replete with many an interesting and valuable architectural lesson. It exhibits pointed arches, pinnacles, buttresses, tracery and clustered columns, rib-vaultings, and lofty towers; all those characteristics, in short, the bare enunciation of which is considered by many writers to be a sufficient definition of Gothic." — *Ibid.*

which then were German, Burgundy, Lorraine, Alsace, bordering on the Rhine. It was a splendid gift of Teutonism before Germany rose in insurrection and set itself apart from Latin Christendom. North of the Alps it attained its full perfection; there alone the Cathedral became in its significant symbolism the impersonation of mediæval Christianity.

The Northern climate may have had some connection with its rise and development. In Italy and the South the Sun is a tyrant; breadth of shadow must mitigate his force; the wide eaves, the bold projecting cornice must afford protection from his burning and direct rays; there would be a reluctance altogether to abandon those horizontal lines, which cast a continuous and unbroken shadow; or to ascend as it were with the vertical up into the unslaked depths of the noonday blaze. The violent rains would be cast off more freely by a more flat and level roof at a plane of slight inclination. In the North the precipitate ridge would cast off the heavy snow, which might have lodged and injured the edifice. So, too, within the church the Italian had to cool and diminish, the Northern would admit and welcome the flooding light. So much indeed did the Gothic Architecture enlarge and multiply the apertures for light, that in order to restore the solemnity it was obliged to subdue and sheathe as it were the glare, at times overpowering, by painted glass. And thus the magic of the richest coloring was added to the infinitely diversified forms of the architecture.

The Gothic cathedral was the consummation, the completion of mediæval, of hierarchical Christianity. Of that mediævalism, of that hierarchism (though

Italy was the domain, and Rome the capital of the Pope), the seat was beyond the Alps. The mediæval hierarchical services did not rise to their full majesty and impressiveness till celebrated under a Gothic cathedral. The church might seem to expand, and lay itself out in long and narrow avenues, with the most gracefully converging perspective, in order that the worshipper might contemplate with deeper awe the more remote central ceremonial. The enormous height more than compensated for the contracted breadth. Nothing could be more finely arranged for the processional services; and the processional services became more frequent, more imposing. The music, instead of being beaten down by low broad arches, or lost within the heavier aisles, soared freely to the lofty roof, pervaded the whole building, was infinitely multiplied as it died and rose again to the fretted roof. Even the incense curling more freely up to the immeasurable height, might give the notion of clouds of adoration finding their way to heaven.

The Gothic cathedral remains an imperishable and majestic monument of hierarchical wealth, ^{Symbolism of Gothic archi-} power, devotion; it can hardly be absolutely ^{itecture.} called self-sacrifice, for if built for the honor of God and of the Redeemer, it was honor, it was almost worship, shared in by the high ecclesiastic. That however has almost passed away; God, as it were, now vindicates to himself his own. The cathedral has been described as a vast book in stone, a book which taught by symbolic language, partly plain and obvious to the simpler man, partly shrouded in not less attractive mystery. It was at once strikingly significant and inexhaustible; bewildering, feeding at once and stimulating profound

meditation. Even its height, its vastness might appear to suggest the Inconceivable, the Incomprehensible in the Godhead, to symbolize the Infinity, the incalculable grandeur and majesty of the divine works; the mind felt humble under its shadow as before an awful presence. Its form and distribution was a confession of faith; it typified the creed. Everywhere was the mystic number; the Trinity was proclaimed by the nave and the aisles (multiplied sometimes as at Bourges and elsewhere to the other sacred number, seven), the three richly ornamented recesses of the portal, the three towers. The Rose over the west was the Unity; the whole building was a Cross. The altar with its decorations announced the Real Perpetual Presence. The solemn Crypt below represented the under world, the soul of man in darkness and the shadow of death, the body awaiting the resurrection. This was the more obvious universal language. By those who sought more abstruse and recondite mysteries, they might be found in all the multifarious details, provoking the zealous curiosity, or dimly suggestive of holy meaning. Sculpture was called in to aid. All the great objective truths of religion had their fitting place. Even the Father, either in familiar symbol or in actual form, began to appear, and to assert his property in the sacred building. Already in the Romanesque edifices the Son, either as the babe in the lap of his Virgin Mother, on the cross, or ascending into heaven, had taken his place over the central entrance, as it were to receive and welcome the worshipper. Before long he appeared not there alone, though there in more imposing form; he was seen throughout all his wondrous history, with

all his acts and miracles, down to the Resurrection, the Ascension, the return to Judgment. Everywhere was that hallowed form, in infancy, in power, on the cross, on the right hand of the Father, coming down amid the hosts of angels. The most stupendous, the most multifarious scenes were represented in reliefs more or less bold, prominent, and vigorous, or rude and harsh. The carving now aspired to more than human beauty, or it delighted in the most hideous ugliness; majestic gentle Angels, grinning hateful sometimes half-comic Devils. But it was not only the New and the Old Testament, it was the Golden Legend also which might be read in the unexhausted language of the cathedral. Our Lady had her own chapels for her own special votaries, and toward the East, behind the altar, the place of honor. Not only were there the twelve Apostles, the four Evangelists, the Martyrs, the four great Doctors of the Latin Church, each in his recognized form, and with his peculiar symbol, — the whole edifice swarmed with Saints within and without, on the walls, on the painted windows, over the side altars. For now the mystery was so awful that it might be administered more near to the common eye, upon the altar in every succursal chapel which lined the building: it was secure in its own sanctity. There were the Saints local, national, or those especially to whom the building was dedicated; and the celestial hierarchy of the Areopagite, with its ascending orders, and conventional forms, the winged seraph, the cherubic face. The whole in its vastness and intricacy was to the outward sense and to the imagination what Scholasticism was to the intellect, an enormous effort, a waste and prodigality

of power, which confounded and bewildered rather than enlightened; at the utmost awoke vague and indistinct emotion.

But even therein was the secret of the imperishable power of the Gothic cathedrals. Their hieroglyphic language, in its more abstruse terms, became obsolete and unintelligible; it was a purely hierarchical dialect; its meaning, confined to the hierarchy, gradually lost its signification even to them. But the cathedrals themselves retired as it were into more simple and more commanding majesty, into the solemn grandeur of their general effect. They rested only on the wonderful boldness and unity of their design, the richness of their detail. Content now to appeal to the indelible, inextinguishable kindred and affinity of the human heart to grandeur, grace, and beauty, the countless statues from objects of adoration became architectural ornaments. So the mediæval churches survive in their influence on the mind and the soul of man. Their venerable antiquity comes in some sort in aid of their innate religiousness. It is that about them which was temporary and accessory, their hierarchical character, which has chiefly dropped from them and become obsolete. They are now more absolutely and exclusively churches for the worship of God. As the mediæval pageantry has passed away, or shrunk into less imposing forms, the one object of worship, Christ, or God in Christ, has taken more full and absolute possession of the edifice. Where the service is more simple, as in our York, Durham, or Westminster, or even where the old faith prevails, in Cologne, in Antwerp, in Strasburg, in Rheims, in Bourges, in Rouen, it has become more popular, less ecclesiastical: everywhere the priest is

CHAP. VIII. SYMBOLS OF GOTHIC ARCHITECT

now, according to the common sentiment
Minister, less the half-divinized Mediator
all that is the higher attribute and essence
architecture retains its nobler, and, in the
its religious power. The Gothic cathedra
be contemplated without awe, or entered v
tion.

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIAN SCULPTURE.

DURING almost all this period Christian Sculpture was accessory, or rather subsidiary to architecture. The use of Statues was to ornament and enrich the building. In her Western conquests, under Justinian, Constantinople sent back no sculptors; only architects with her domes, and her Greek cross, and her splendid workers in mosaic. The prodigality with which Constantine, as Rome of old, despoiled the world to adorn his new city with ancient works of sculpture, put to shame, it should seem, rather than awoke the emulation of Christian Art. We have seen Constantine usurp the form, the attributes, even the statue of Apollo.¹ We have heard even Theodosius do homage to art, and spare statues of heathen deities for their exquisite workmanship. Christian historians, Christian poets, lavish all their eloquence, and all their glowing verse on the treasures of ancient art. They describe with the utmost admiration the gods, the mythological personages, those especially that crowded the baths of Zeuxippus;² which perished with the old

¹ History of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 408; iii. 494. The whole passage.

² Cedrenus, v. i. p. 648, Ed. Bonn. The Ecphrasis of Christodorus, is a Poem, for its age, of much spirit and beauty. See especially the descriptions of Hecuba and of Homer. — Jacobs, Anthologia.

Church of St. Sophia in the fatal conflagration in the fifth year of Justinian. In the Lausus stood the unrivalled Cnidian Venus of Praxiteles; the Samian Juno of Lysippos;¹ the ivory Jove of Phidias. The whole city was thronged with statues of the Emperors and their Queens, of Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, Arcadius, and Honorius, Justinian, Leo, Theodora, Pulcheria, Eudocia.² It is even said that there were marble statues of Arius, Macedonius, Sabellius, and Eunomius, which were exposed to filthy indignities by the orthodox Theodosius.³ It appears not how far Sculpture had dared to embody in brass or in marble the hallowed and awful objects of Christian worship. It should seem indeed that the Iconoclastic Emperors found statues, and those statues objects of adoration, to war upon. Though in the word Iconoclast, the image-breaker, the word for image is ambiguous; still the breaking seems to imply something more destructive than the effacing pictures, or picking out mosaics: it is the dashing to pieces something hard and solid. This controversy in the second Nicene Council comprehends images of brass or stone; one of the perpetual precedents is the statue of the Redeemer said to have been raised at Paneas in Syria.⁴ The carved symbolic images of the Jewish ark are constantly alleged.⁵ Those are accursed who compare the images of the Lord and

¹ So at least says Cedrenus, p. 564.

² All these will be found in the description of Constantinople by Petrus Gyllius. The work was translated by John Ball, London, 1729.

³ Gyllius, b. ii. c. xxiii.

⁴ Act. Concil. Nicen. ii. A. D. 787, ἀνδρίαντι τῷ Χριστῷ. It was said to have been raised by the woman cured of an issue of blood, p. 14; ἐστῆσαν δὲ καὶ εἰκόνα — of a certain Saint in an oratory, p. 23.

⁵ The Sculptilia in the Old Testament, p. 45.

of the Saints to the statues of Satanic Idols.¹ If we worship stones as Gods, how do we worship the Martyrs and Apostles who broke down and destroyed idols of stone?² The homage paid to the statues of the Emperors was constantly urged to repel the accusation of idolatry. Yet probably statues which represented objects of Christian worship were extremely rare; and when Image-worship was restored, what may be called its song of victory, is silent as to Sculptures:³ the Lord,

¹ Those are anathematized — τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ κυριοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως τοῖς Ἑοανοῖς τῶν Σατανικῶν εἰδώλων ὀνομάσαντας · σεπτὰς καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας τὰς ἐκ χρώματων καὶ ψήφιδος καὶ ἐτέρας ὕλης ἐπιτηδείως ἔχουσας ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν ἱεροῖς σκεύεσι καὶ ἐσθῆσι τοίχοις τε καὶ σανίσιν, οἴκοις τε καὶ ὁδοῖς, p. 375. In this minute enumeration the first must be statues. The letter of Tarasius is less clear: it mentions only painting, mosaics, waxen tablets, and σανίδες.

² Εἰ τοὺς λίθους ὡς θεοὺς δοξάζω (if I give really divine worship to these stones, as I am accused) πῶς τιμῶ καὶ προσκυνῶ τοὺς μάρτυρας καὶ ἀποστόλους συντρίψαντας καὶ ἀπολέσαντας τὰ λίθινα ζώδια; — The address of Leontius, p. 48.

³ See the Poem in the Anthologia (χριστιάνικα Ἐπιγράμματα), Jacobs I. 28.

ἔλαμψεν ἄκτις τῆς ἁληθείας πάλιν
καὶ τὰς κόρας ἡμβλυνε τῶν ψευδηγόρων ·
ἠύξησεν εὐσεβεία, πέπτωκε πλάνη ·
καὶ πίστις ἀνθεῖ, καὶ πλατύνεται χάρις.
Ἰδοῦ γὰρ αὐθις Χριστὸς εἰκονισμένος
λάμπει πρὸς ὕψος τῆς καθέδρας τοῦ κράτους,
καὶ τὰς σκοτεινὰς αἰρέσεις ἀνατρέπει.
Τῆς εἰσόδου δ' ὑπερθεν, ὡς θεία πύλη,
στηλογραφεῖται, καὶ φύλαξ, ἡ παρθένος,
ἄναξ δὲ καὶ πρόεδρος, ὡς πλανοτρόποι
σὺν τοῖς συνεργοῖς ἱστοροῦνται πλησίον ·
κύκλῳ δὲ παντὸς οἷα φρουροὶ τοῦ δόμου,
νοεῖς (Angeli) μαθηταί, μάρτυρες, θνητόλοι,
ὄθεν καλοῦμεν Χριστοτρίκλινον νέον,
τὸν πρὶν λαχόντα κλήσεως χρυσωνόμου,
ὡς τὸν θρόνον ἔχοντα Χριστοῦ κυρίου,
Χριστοῦ δὲ μητρὸς, Χριστοκηρύκων τύπος,
καὶ τοῦ σοφουργοῦ Μιχαὴλ τὴν εἰκόνα.

the Virgin, the Angels, Saints, Martyrs, Priesthood, take their place over the portal entrance ; but shining in colors to blind the eyes of the heretics. To the keener perception of the Greeks there may have arisen a feeling that in its more rigid and solid form the Image was more near to the Idol. At the same time, the art of Sculpture and casting in bronze was probably more degenerate and out of use ; at all events, it was too slow and laborious to supply the demand of triumphant zeal in the restoration of the persecuted Images. There was therefore a tacit compromise ; nothing appeared but painting, mosaics, engraving on cups and chalices, embroidery on vestments. The renunciation of Sculpture grew into a rigid passionate aversion. The Greek at length learned to contemplate that kind of more definite and full representation of the Deity or the Saints with the aversion of a Jew or a Mohammedan.¹ Yet some admiration for ancient Sculpture of heathen objects lingered behind in the Grecian mind. In his vehement and bitter lamentation over the destruction of all the beautiful works of bronze by the Crusaders in the Latin Conquest of Constantinople, Nicetas is not content with

Christian
Sculpture
proscribed
in the East.

This was Michael the Drunkard, son of Theodora (Jacobs's Note.) Compare vol. ii. p. 141. Was the Painting of Michael the Archangel, celebrated in two other Epigrams, erected on this occasion ? — (Pp. 12, 13.)

Ἄσκοπον ἀγγελίαρχον, ὡσώματον εἰδεῖ μορφῆς.

Ἄ μετὰ τολμῆεις κηρὸς ὑπεπλύσατο ·

οἶδε δὲ τέχνη

χρῶμασι πορθμεῦσαι τὴν φρενὸς ἱκεσίην.

¹ Nicephorus Critopulos, a late writer, says, *τούτων οὐκ εἰκονας ἡ ἐκκλήσια ἐποίει οὐ γλυπτὰς οὐδὲ λαξευτὰς ἀλλὰ γραπτὰς μόνον*, quoted in Suicer, who speaks justly of “*Imagines sculptas et excisas, ipsiusque Dei representationes apud Græcos etiamnum ignotas.*” The exquisite small carvings in ivory were permitted seemingly in all ages of Byzantine art.

branding the avarice which cast all these wonderful statues into the melting-pot to turn them into money; he denounces the barbarians as dead to every sense of beauty,¹ who remorselessly destroyed the colossal Juno, the equestrian Bellerophon, the Hercules; as regardless of the proud reminiscences of old Rome, they melted the swine and the wolf which suckled Romulus and Remus, and the ass with its driver set up by Augustus after the battle of Actium; they feared not to seize the magic eagle of Apollonius of Tyana. Even the exquisite Helen, who set the world in arms, notwithstanding her unrivalled beauty and her fame, touched not, and did not soften those iron-hearted, those unlettered savages, who could not read, who had never heard of Homer.²

The West might seem to assert its more bold and free image-worship by its unrestrained and prodigal display of religious sculpture; still it was mostly sculpture decorative, or forming an integral part of Architecture. It was not the ordinary occupation of Sculpture to furnish the beautiful single statue of marble or of bronze. Rome had no succession of Emperors, whose attribute and privilege it was to a late period in Constantinople to have their image set up for the homage of the people, and so to keep alive the art of carving marble or casting bronze. But gradually in the Romanesque, as in the later Gothic Architecture,

¹ Nicetas Choniata de Signis, οἱ τοῦ καλοῦ ἀνέραστοι οὗτοι βάρβαροι. Some called the equestrian Bellerophon Joshua the Son of Nun. This is remarkable.

² Of Helen he says — ἄρ' ἐμείλιξε τοὺς δυσμελίκτους; ἄρ' ἐμύλθαξε ταῖς σιδηρόφρονας; . . . ἄλλως τε ποῦ παρὰ ἀγγραμμάτοις βαρβύροις καὶ τέλειον ἀναλφαβήτοις ἀναγνώσις καὶ γνῶσις τῶν ἐπὶ σοὶ ραψωδηθέντων ἐκείνων; — Edit. Bonn., p. 863.

the west front of the Churches might seem, as it were, the chosen place for sacred Images. Not merely did the Saviour and the Virgin appear as the Guardian Deities over the portal, gradually the Host of Heaven, Angels, Apostles, Martyrs, Evangelists, Saints spread over the whole façade. They stood on pedestals or in niches; reliefs more or less high found their panels in the walls; the heads of the portal arches were carved in rich designs; the semicircle more or less round or pointed, above the level line of the door, was crowded with sacred scenes, or figures. But in all these, as in other statues if such there were, within the Churches, Christian modesty required that human or divinized figures must be fully clad. Sculpture, whose essence is form, found the naked human figure almost under proscription. There remained nothing for the sculptor's art but the attitude, the countenance, and the more or less graceful fall of the drapery; all this too, in strict subordination to the architectural effect; with this he must be content, and not aspire to centre on himself and his work the admiring and long dwelling eye.¹ The Sculptor, in general, instead of the votary and master of a high and independent art, became the workman of the architect; a step or two higher than the carver of the capital, the moulding, the knosp, or the finial.² In some respects the progress of Gothic, though it multiplied images to infinity, was unfavora-

¹ Even as the Crucifix Schnaase has justly said, "Gleichzeitig änderte sich auch die Tracht des Gekreuzigten; die lange Tunica, welche früher den Körper ganz verhüllte, wird schon in 12 Jahr. kürzer, im 13 und noch allgemeiner in 14 vertritt ein Schurz um die Hüfte ihre Stelle." — iv. p. 390.

² It is to be observed that the Statues were only intended to be seen in front.

ble; as the niches became loftier and narrower, the Saints rose to disproportionate stature, shrunk to meagre gracility, they became ghosts in long shrouds. Sometimes set on high upon pinnacles, or crowded in hosts as at Milan, they lost all distinctness, and were absolutely nothing more than architectural ornaments.

All, no doubt, even as regards sculptural excellence, is not equally rude, barbarous, or barren. So many artists could not be employed, even under conventional restrictions, on subjects so suggestive of high and solemn emotion, men themselves under deep devotional feelings, without communicating to the hard stone some of their own conceptions of majesty, awfulness, serenity, grace, beauty. The sagacious judgment among the crowds of figures in front of our Cathedrals may discern some of the nobler attributes of Sculpture, dignity, expression, skilful and flowing disposition of drapery, even while that judgment is not prompted and kindled by reverential religiousness, as is often the case, to imagine that in the statue which is in the man's own mind. In the reliefs, if there be more often confusion, grotesqueness, there is not seldom vigor and distinctness, skilful grouping, an artistic representation of an impressive scene. The animals are almost invariably hard, conventional emblems not drawn from nature; but the human figure, if without anatomical precision, mostly unnecessary when so amply swathed in drapery, in its outline and proportions is at times nobly developed. Yet, on the whole, the indulgence usually claimed and readily conceded for the state of art at the period, is in itself the unanswerable testimony to its imperfection and barbarism. Christian Sculpture must produce, as

it did afterwards produce, something greater, with John of Bologna and Michael Angelo, or it must be content to leave to heathen Greece the uncontested supremacy in this wonderful art. Sculpture, in truth, must learn from ancient art those elementary lessons which Christianity could not teach, which it dared not, or would not venture to teach; it must go back to Greece for that revelation of the inexhaustible beauties of the human form which had long been shrouded from the eyes of men. The anthropomorphism of the Greeks grew out of, and at the same time fully developed the physical perfection of the human body. That perfection was the model, the ideal of the Sculptor. The gods in stature, force, majesty, proportion, beauty, were but superhuman men. To the Christian there was still some disdain of the sensual perishable body; with monasticism, that disdain grew into contempt; it must be abased, macerated, subdued. The utmost beauty which it could be allowed was patience, meekness, gentleness, lowliness. To the fully developed athlete succeeded the emaciated saint. The man of sorrows, the form "of the servant," still lingered in the Divine Redeemer; the Saint must be glorified in meekness; the Martyr must still bear the sign and expression of his humiliation. The whole age might seem determined to disguise and conceal, even if not to debase, the human form, the Sculptor's proper domain and study, in its free vigorous movement or stately tranquillity. The majestic Prelate was enveloped, in his gorgeous and cumbrous habiliments, which dazzled with their splendor; the strong, tall, noble Knight was sheathed in steel; even the Monk or Friar was swathed in his coarse ungainly dress, and cowl. Even for its dra-

peries reviving Sculpture must go back to the antique.

There was one branch, however, of the art—**Monumental Sculpture**—which assumed a peculiar character and importance under Christianity, and aspired to originality and creativeness. Even Monumental Sculpture, in the Middle Ages, was in some degree architectural. The tomb upon which, the canopy under which, lay the King, the Bishop, or the Knight, or the Lady, was as carefully and as elaborately wrought as the slumbering image. In the repose, in the expression of serene sleep, in the lingering majesty, gentleness, or holiness of countenance of these effigies there is often singular beauty.¹ Repose is that in which Sculpture delights; the repose, or the collapsing into rest, of a superhuman being, after vigorous exertion; nothing, therefore, could be more exquisitely suited to the art than the peace of the Christian sleeping after a weary life, sleeping in conscious immortality, sleeping to awake to a calm and joyful resurrection. Even the drapery, for Sculpture must here, above all, submit to conceal the form in drapery, is at rest. But Monumental Sculpture did not confine itself to the single recumbent figure. The first great Christian Sculptor, Nicolo Pisano, in the former part of the 14th century, showed his earliest skill and excellence in the reliefs round the tomb of St. Dominic at Bologna.² It

¹ Among the noblest tombs in Italy are that of Benedict XI. at Perugia, by John, son of Nicolo Pisano; of Gregory X., by Margaritone, at Arezzo; of John XXIII., at Florence, by Donatello. Our own Cathedrals have noble specimens of somewhat ruder work—the Edward III., Queen Philippa, and Richard II. in Westminster Abbey.

² See on Nicolo Pisano, Cicognara *Storia de Scultura*, v. 111, with the Illustrative Prints. In Count Cicognara's engravings the transition from

is remarkable that the first great Christian Sculptor was a distinguished architect. Nicolo Pisano had manifestly studied at Rome and elsewhere the remains of ancient art; they guide and animate, but only guide and animate his bold and vigorous chisel. Christian in form and sentiment, some of his figures have all the grace and ease of Grecian Art. Nicolo Pisano stood, indeed, alone almost as much in advance of his successors, as of those who had gone before.¹ Nor did Nicolo Pisano confine himself to Monumental Sculpture. The spacious pulpits began to offer panels which might be well filled up with awful admonitory reliefs. In those of Pisa and Sienna the master, in others his disciples and scholars, displayed their vigor and power. There was one scene which permitted them to reveal the naked form — the Last Judgment. Men, women, rose unclad from their tombs. And it is singular to remark how Nicolo Pisano seized all that was truly noble and sculptural. The human form appears in infinite variety of bold yet natural attitude, without the grotesque distortions, without the wild extravagances, the writhing, the shrinking from the twisting serpents, the torturing fiends, the monsters preying upon the vitals. Nicolo wrought before Dante, and maintained the sobriety of his art. Later Sculpture and Painting must aspire to represent all that Poetry had represented, and but

the earliest masters to Nicolo Pisano, is to be transported to another age, to overleap centuries.

¹ Count Cicognara writes thus: all that I have seen, and all the Count's illustrations, confirm his judgment: — Tutto ciò che lo aveva proceduto era molto al di sotto de lui, e per elevarsi ad un tratto fu forza d' un genio straordinario, p. 223. E le opere degli scolari di Niccolo ci sembreranno talvolta della mano de suoi predecessori, p. 234. Guilds of Sculpture now arose at Sienna and elsewhere.

imperfectly represented in words: it must illustrate Dante.

But in the first half of the fifteenth century, during the Popedom of Eugenius and Nicolas V., Sculpture broke loose from its architectural servitude, and with Donatello, and with Brunelleschi (if Brunelleschi had not turned aside and devoted himself exclusively to architectural art) even with Ghiberti, asserted its dignity and independence as a creative art.¹ The Evangelist or the Saint began to stand alone trusting to his own majesty, not depending on his position as part of an harmonious architectural design. The St. Mark and the St. George of Donatello are noble statues, fit to take their place in the public squares of Florence. In his fine David, after the death of Goliath, above all in his Judith and Holofernes, Donatello took a bolder flight. In that masterly work (writes Vasari) the simplicity of the dress and countenance of Judith manifests her lofty spirit and the aid of God; as in Holofernes wine, sleep, and death are expressed in his limbs; which, having lost their animating spirit, are cold and failing. Donatello succeeded so well in portrait statuary, that to his favorite female statue he said — Speak! speak! His fame at Padua was unrivalled. Of him it was nobly said, either Donatello was a prophetic anticipation of Buonarotti, or Donatello lived again in Buonarotti.

Ghiberti's great work was the gates of the Bap-

¹ Donatello born 1383, died 1466; Brunelleschi 1398; Ghiberti 1378, died 1455. I ought perhaps to have added Jacobo della Quercia, who worked rather earlier at Bologna and Sienna. Read in Vasari the curious contest between Donatello and Brunelleschi, in which Donatello owned that while himself made an unrivalled Contadino, Brunelleschi made a Christ. See Vasari on the works of Donatello.

tistery at Florence, deserving, in Mich phrase, to be called the Gates of Heaven from their copiousness, felicity, and unrivalled designs, that these gates demanded their fame.

CHAPTER X.

CHRISTIAN PAINTING.

PAINTING, which, with architecture and music, attained its perfect and consummate excellence under the influence of Latin Christianity, had yet to await the century which followed the pontificate of Nicolas V. before it culminated, through Francia and Perugino, in Michael Angelo, Leonardo, Raffaele, Correggio, and Titian. It received only its first impulse from mediæval Christianity; its perfection was simultaneous with the revival of classical letters and ancient art. Religion had in a great degree to contest the homage, even of its greatest masters, with a dangerous rival. Some few only of its noblest professors were at that time entirely faithful to Christian art. But all these, as well as the second Teutonic school, Albert Durer and his followers, are beyond our bounds.¹

Of the great Epochs of Painting, therefore, two

It were unwise and presumptuous (since our survey here also must be brief and rapid) to enter into the artistic and antiquarian questions which have been agitated and discussed with so much knowledge and industry by German writers, especially (though I would not pass over Lanzi, still less the new Annotated Edition of Vasari) by the Baron Rumohr (*Italienische Schulen*), my friend M. Rio (*Art Chrétien*), by Kugler and his accomplished Translators, and by Lord Lindsay (*Christian Art*). In my history I shall endeavor to indicate the sources from which it can be lifted, justified, or filled up.

only, preparatory to the Perfect Age, belong to our present history: I. That which is called (I cannot but think too exclusively) the Byzantine period; II. That initiatory branch of Italian art which I will venture to name, from the subjects it chose, the buildings which it chiefly adorned, and the profession of many of the best masters who practised it, the Cloistral epoch. The second period reached its height in Frà Angelico da Fiesole.¹

It is impossible to doubt that Painting, along with the conservation of some of its technical processes, and with some traditionary forms, and the conventional representation of certain scenes in the Scriptural History or in Legends, preserved certain likenesses, as they were thought to be, of the Saviour and his Apostles and Martyrs, designated by fixed and determinate lineaments, as well as by their symbolical attributes. The paintings in the Catacombs at Rome show such forms and countenances in almost unbroken descent till nearly two centuries after the conversion of Constantine.² The history of Iconoclasm has recorded how such pictures were in the East religiously defended, religiously

¹ Born 1387 — became a Dominican 1407.

² Much has been done during the last few years in the Catacombs. The great French Publication, by M. Louis Perret, is beautiful; if it be as true as beautiful, by some inexplicable means, some of the paintings have become infinitely more distinct and brilliant, since I saw them some thirty years ago. It is unfortunate that the passion for early art, and polemic passion, are so busy in discovering what they are determined to find, that sober, historical, and artistic criticism is fairly bewildered. There are two important questions yet to be settled: when did the Catacombs cease to be places of burial? (what is the date of the later cemeteries of Rome?) when did the Catacomb Chapels cease to be places not of public worship, but of fervent private devotion? To the end of that period, whenever it was, they would continue to be embellished by art, and therefore the difficulty of affixing dates to works of art is increased.

destroyed, religiously restored; how the West, in defiance, as it were, and contempt of the impious persecutor, seemed to take a new impulse, and the Popes of the Iconoclastic age lavished large sums on decorations of their churches by paintings, if not by sculpture. No doubt, also, many monk-artists fled from the sacrilegious East to practise their holy art in the safe and quiet West. Even a century or more before this, it is manifest that Justinian's conquest of Italy, as it brought the Byzantine form of architecture, so it brought the Byzantine skill, the modes and usages of the subsidiary art. The Byzantine painting of that age lives in the mosaics (the more durable process of that, in all its other forms, too perishable art) on the walls of the Church of San Vitale, and in St. Apollinaris, in Ravenna, and in other Italian cities under Greek influence. These mosaics maintain the indefeasible character¹ of Greek Christianity. The vast, majestic image of the Saviour broods indeed over the place of honor, above the high altar; but on the chancel-walls, within the Sanctuary, are on one side the Emperor, Theodora on the other, not Saints or Martyrs, not Bishops or Popes. It cannot be argued, from the survival of these more lasting works, that mosaic predominated over other modes of painting, either in Constantinople or in the Byzantinized parts of the West. But as it was more congenial to the times, being a work more technical and mechanical, so no doubt it tended to the hard, stiff, conventional forms which in general characterize Byzantine art, as well as to their perpetuity. The traditions of painting lived on. Tho

¹ On the Mosaics of Leo III., *Anastasius in vit.* compare Schnaase, *Bildende Kunst*, iii. p. 505.

descriptions of the paintings on the walls of the Romans¹ by the poets of the fourth or fifth centuries bear striking resemblance to those of the poets of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, of the works which adorned Aix-la-Chapelle and the Palace of Ingelheim. How far, during all this period, it was old Roman art, or Roman art modified by Byzantine influences, may seem a question unimportant to general history, and probably incapable of a full solution. We must confine ourselves to that which is specially and exclusively Christian art.

Of all Christian painting during this long period, from the extinction of Paganism to the rise of Italian art (its first dawn at the beginning of the twelfth century, brightening gradually to the time of Nicolas V.), the one characteristic is that its object was worship, not art. It was a mute preaching, which addressed not the refined and intelligent, but the vulgar of all ranks.² Its utmost aim was to awaken religious emo-

¹ In the Castle Villa of Pontius Leontius on the Garonne, in the verses of Sidonius Apollonius, Carm. xxii., were painted on one part scenes from the Mithridatic war waged by Lucullus; on the other the opening Chapters of the Old Testament. *Recutitorum primordia Judæorum*. Sidonius seems to have been surprised at the splendor and duration of the colors:

*Perpetuum pictura micat, nec tempore longo
Depreciata suas turpant pigmenta figuras. — C. 202.*

Fortunatus mentions wood-carving as rivalling painting,

Quos pictura solet, ligna dedere jocos.

See Eimondus Nigellus, for the paintings at Ingelheim.

² See the Greek Epigram on the painting of Michael the Archangel.

*Ὡς θρασὺ μορφῶσαι τὸν ἰσώματον · ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰκὼν
ἐς νοερὴν ἀνάγει μνήστιν ἐπουρανίων.*

Jacobs, p. 14.

This whole series of Epigrams was inscribed, no doubt, either under paintings, or under illuminations in MSS.

tion, to suggest religious thought. It was therefore — more, no doubt, in the East than in the West — rigidly traditional, conventional, hierarchical. Each form had its special type, from which it was dangerous, at length forbidden to depart. Each scene, with its grouping and arrangement, was consecrated by long reverence; the artist worked in the trammels of usage; he had faithfully to transmit to others that which he had received, and no more. Invention was proscribed; novelty might incur the suspicion almost of heresy — at all events it would be an unintelligible language. Symbolism without a key; it would either jar on sacred associations, or perplex, or offend.¹

From the earliest period there had been two traditional conceptions of that which was the central figure of Christian art, the Lord himself. One represented the Saviour as a beautiful youth, beardless — a purely ideal image, typical perhaps of the rejuvenescence of mankind in Christ.² Such was the prevailing, if not the exclusive conception of the Redeemer in the West. In the East, the Christ is of mature age, of tall stature, meeting eyebrows, beautiful eyes, fine-formed nose, curling hair, figure slightly bowed, of delicate complexion, dark beard (it is sometimes called wine-colored

¹ Kugler has the quotation from the Acts of the Council of Nice, which show that the Byzantine painters worked according to a law, *θέσμος*. But M. Didron's work, *Manual d'Iconographie Chrétienne*, at once proved the existence, and in fact published this law, according to which, in his vivid words — *L'artiste Grec est asservi aux traditions comme l'animal à son instinct, il fait une figure comme l'hirondelle son nid ou l'abeille sa ruche*, p. iv. The Greek Painter's Guide, which fills the greater part of M. Didron's book, gives all the rules of technical procedure and design.

² Didron, *Hist. de Dieu*, and a translation published by Bohn, p. 249. But compare the two heads from the Catacombs, engraved in the Translation of Kugler. These, *if both indeed represent the Redeemer*, and are of the period supposed, approximate more nearly to the Eastern type.

beard), his face, like his mother's, of the color of wheat, long fingers, sonorous voice, and sweet eloquence (how was this painted?),¹ most gentle, quiet, long-suffering, patient, with all kindred graces, blending the manhood with the attributes of God. In the fabulous letter ascribed to Lentulus, descriptive of the person of the Redeemer, this conception is amplified into still higher beauty.² The truth seems to be that this youthful Western type was absolutely and confessedly ideal; it was symbolic of the calm, gentle, young, world-renewing religion. In one place the Christ seems standing on the mystic mountain from whence issue the four rivers of Paradise, the Gospels of everlasting life.³ The tradition of the actual likeness was Eastern (it was unknown to Augustine), and this tradition in all its forms, at the second Council of Nicea, and in the writings of John of Damascus, became historical fact. Though at that time there was not much respect for Scripture or probability, yet the

¹ Didron, p. 248, from John of Damascus. M. Didron has fully investigated the subject, but with an utter and total want of historical criticism. He accepts this controversial tract of John of Damascus (he does not seem to read Greek) as an authority for all the old Legends of Abgarus of Edessa, and the likenesses of Christ painted or carved by order of Constantine.

² Compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. p. 507, for the translation of Lentulus. I am astounded at finding in a book like Kugler's (the English translation especially having undergone such supervision) the assertion that this letter of Lentulus may "possibly be assigned to the third century," p. 12. What evidence is there of its existence before the ninth or even the eleventh century? It is a strange argument, the only one that I can find, that the description resembles some of the earliest so-called Portraits of the Saviour, even one in the Catacombs. It is clear that it was unknown to the early Fathers, especially to St. Augustine. If known, it must have been adduced at the Council of Nicea, and by John of Damascus. But even the fable had not been heard of at that time. I have not the least doubt that it was a fiction growing out of the controversy.

³ Didron, p. 251.

youthful, almost boyish type of the Western Church, if it still survived, was so directly at issue with the recorded age of Jesus, that even in the West the description in John of Damascus, embellished into the bolder fiction of Lentulus, the offspring, and not the parent of the controversy, found general acceptance in the West as in the East.¹

But the triumph of Iconoclasm had been a monastic triumph—a triumph for which the monks had suffered, and admired each other's martyr sufferings. Gradually misery and pain became the noblest, dearest images; the joyous and elevating, if still lowly, emotions of the older faith, gave place altogether to gloom, to dreary depression. Among one class of painters, Monks of St. Basil. Black School. the monks of St. Basil, there was a reaction to absolute blackness and ugliness. The Saviour became a dismal, macerated, self-tortured monk. Light vanished from his brow; gentleness from his features; calm, serene majesty from his attitude.

Another change, about the tenth century, came Change in the tenth century. over the image of the Lord. It was no longer the mild Redeemer, but the terrible Judge, which painting strove to represent. As the prayers, the hymns, gradually declined from the calm, if not jubilant tone of the earliest Church, the song of deliverance from hopeless unawakening death, the triumph in the assurance of eternal life,—so the

¹ Hence too the Veronica, the vera *εἰκών*, a singular blending of Greek and Latin fiction and language. William Grimm, however, in his "Die Sage von Ursprung der Christus Bilder," treats this as a fancy of Mabillon and Papebroch. He derives it from the traditional name, *βερονικη*, of the woman whose issue of blood was stanchd, who *traditionally* also was the St. Veronica. — Berlin. Transact., 1843.

youthful symbol of the new religion, the form which the Godhead, by its indwelling, beautified and glorified, the still meek, if commanding look of the Redeemer, altogether disappeared, or ceased to be the most ordinary and dominant character: he became the King of tremendous majesty, before whom stood shuddering, guilty, and resuscitated mankind.¹ The Cross, too, by degrees, became the Crucifix.² The image of the Lord on the Cross was at first meek, though suffering; pain was represented, but pain overcome by patience; it was still a clothed form, with long drapery. By degrees it was stripped to ghastly nakedness; agony became the prevailing, absorbing tone. The intensity of the suffering strove at least to subdue the sublime resignation of the sufferer; the object of the artist was to wring the spectator's heart with fear and anguish, rather than to chasten with quiet sorrow or elevate with faith and hope; to aggravate the sin of man, rather than display the mercy of God. Painting vied with the rude sculpture which arose in many quarters, (sculpture more often in wood than in stone,) and by the red streaming blood, and the more vivid expression of pain in the convulsed limbs, deepened the effect; till, at last, that most hideous and repulsive object, the painted Crucifix, was offered to the groaning worship of mankind.³

¹ See the observations of Schnaase above, p. 599, note.

² Schnaase says that the first Byzantine representation of the Crucifixion is in a Codex of the time of Basil the Macedonian (867-886), iii. p. 216.

³ The curious and just observations of M. Didron should be borne in mind in the History of Christian Painting. "Nous dirons à cette occasion, qu'il n'y aurait rien de plus intéressant qu'à signaler dans l'ordre chronologique les sujets de la Bible, du Martyrologe, et de la Légende, que les différentes époques ont surtout affectionnés. Dans les catacombes il n'y a pas

But this was only one usage, though the dominant one—one school of Byzantine art. Painting, both at Constantinople and in Italy, was more true to its own dignity, and to Christianity. It still strove to maintain nobler conceptions of the God-Man, and to embody the Divinity glorifying the flesh in which it dwelt. In this respect, no doubt, the more durable form of the art would be highly conservative; prevented deeper degeneration. If other painting might dare to abrogate the tradition or the law, Mosaic would be more unable, or more unwilling, to venture upon dangerous originality. It would be a perpetual protest against the encroachments of ugliness and deformity: its attribute, its excellence being brilliancy, strongly contrasted diversity and harmony of rich coloring, it would not consent to darken itself to a dismal monotony. Yet Mosaic can hardly become high art; it is too artificial, too mechanical. It may have, if wrought from good models, an imposing effect; but the finely-evanescent outline, the true magic of coloring, the depth, the light and shade, the half-tints, the blending and melting into each other of hues in their finest gradations, are beyond its powers. The interlaying of small pieces cannot altogether avoid a broken, stippled, spotty effect: it cannot be alive. As it is strong and hard, we can tread it under foot on a pavement, and it is still bright as ever: but in the church, the hall, or

une scène de martyre, mais une foule de sujets relatifs à la résurrection. Les Martyrs et les jugements derniers, avec les représentations des supplices de l'enfer, abondent pendant le moyen âge. A partir de la renaissance à nos jours c'est la douceur, et, disons le mot, la sentimentalité, qui dominent; alors on adopte la bénédiction des petits enfants, et les dévotions qui ont le cœur pour l'objet. Il faut chercher la raison de tous ces faits."—Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie*, p. 182, note. The reason is clear enough.

the chamber, it is an enamelled wall — but it is a wall ;¹ splendid decoration, but aspiring to none of the loftier excellences of art. But throughout this period faithful conservation was in truth the most valuable service. Mosaic fell in with the tendency to conventionalism, and aided in strengthening conventionalism into irresistible law.²

Thus Byzantine art, and Roman art in the West, so far as independent of Byzantine art, went on with its perpetual supply of images, relieved by a blazing golden ground, and with the most glowing colors, but in general stiff, rigid, shapeless, expressionless. Worship still more passionate multiplied its objects ; and those objects it was content to receive according to the established pattern. The more rich and gaudy, the more welcome the offering to the Saint or to the Deity, the more devout the veneration of the worshipper. This character — splendid coloring, the projection of the beautiful but too regular face, or the hard, but not entirely unpliant form, by the rich background — prevails in all the subordinate works of art in East and West — enamels, miniatures, illuminations in manuscripts. In these, not so much images for popular worship, as the slow work of artists dwelling with unbounded delight on their own

¹ Kugler (p. 20) is almost inclined to suspect that historic painting on walls in Mosaic arose under Christian influences in the fourth century. It was before on pavements.

² The account of the earlier Mosaics, and the description of those at Rome and at Ravenna, in Kugler's Handbook, is full and complete. Kugler, it is to be observed, ascribed those in San Vitale, and other works of Justinian and his age in the West, to Roman, not Byzantine Art. This, perhaps, can hardly be determined. The later, at St. Apollinaris in Ravenna, at St. Prassede, and other Churches in Rome, are Byzantine in character: on those of Venice Kugler is fuller. The Art was lost in Italy at the close of the ninth century, to revive again more free and Italian in the eleventh and twelfth.

creations, seem gradually to dawn glimpses of more refined beauty, faces, forms, more instinct with life: even the boundless luxuriance of ornament, flowers, foliage, animals, fantastic forms, would nurse the sense of beauty, and familiarize the hand with more flowing lines, and the mind with a stronger feeling for the graceful for the sake of its grace. It was altogether impossible that, during so many ages, Byzantine art, or the same kind of art in the West, where it was bound by less rigid tradition, and where the guild of painters did not pass down in such regular succession, should not struggle for freedom.¹ The religious emotions which the painter strove to excite in others would kindle in himself, and yearn after something more than the cold immemorial language. By degrees the hard, flat lineaments of the countenance would begin to quicken themselves; its long ungraceful outline would be rounded into fulness and less rigid expression; the tall, straight, meagre form would swell out into some-

¹ I must decline the controversy how far Western Art was Byzantine. It may be possible for the fine sagacity of modern judgment to discriminate between the influences of Byzantine and old Roman Art, as regards the forms and designs of Painting. Yet considering that the Byzantine Artists of Justinian, and the Exarchs of Ravenna, to a far greater extent those who, flying from the Iconoclastic persecution, brought with them the secrets and rules of their art, were received and domiciliated in the Western Monasteries, and that in those Monasteries were chiefly preserved the traditions of the older Italian Art; that at no time was the commercial or political connection of Constantinople and the West quite broken off, and under the Othos the two Courts were cemented by marriage; that all the examples of the period are to be sought in the rigid Mosaic, in miniatures, ivories, illuminations—there must have been so much intermingling of the two streams, that such discrimination must at least be conjectural.—Compare Rio, on what he calls Romano-Christian, independent of Byzantine Art, pp. 32 *et seq.* Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen*, and Kugler. Lord Lindsay is a strong Byzantine; and see in Kugler, p. 77; but Kugler will hardly allow Byzantine Art credit for the original conception or execution of the better designs.

thing like movement, the stiff, fettered extremities separate into the attitude of life; the drapery would become less like the folds which swathe a mummy; the mummy would begin to stir with life. It was impossible but that the Saviour should relax his harsh, stern lineaments; that the child should not become more childlike; the Virgin-Mother waken into maternal tenderness.¹ This effort after emancipation would first take place in those smaller works, the miniatures, the illuminations of manuscripts.² On these the artist could not but work, as has been said, more at his ease; on the whole, in them he would address less numerous perhaps, but more intelligent spectators; he would be less in dread of disturbing popular superstition: and so Taste, the parent and the child of art, would struggle into being. Thus imperceptibly, thus in various

¹ Durandus, in his *Rationale*, i. c. 3, would confine the representation of the Saviour in Churches to three attitudes, either on his throne of glory, on the cross of shame, or in the lap of his Mother. He adds another, as teacher of the world, with the Book in his hand. — See Schnaase, iv. 387, for the various postures (ii. p. 136) of the Child in his Mother's arms. Schnaase, *Geschichte der Bildende Kunst*, says that about the middle of the fifth century the paintings of the Virgin Mary became more common (one has been discovered, which is asserted to be of an earlier period, but we have only the authority of enthusiastic admiration and polemic zeal for its age) in the Catacombs. The great Mosaic in St. Apollinare Nuovo is of the first quarter of the sixth century. Her image, as has been said, floated over the fleet of the Emperor Heraclius I.

² The exquisite grace of the ivory carvings from Constantinople, which show so high and pure a conception for art, as contrasted with the harsh glaring paintings, is perfectly compatible with these views. The ivories were the works of more refined artists for a more refined class. The paintings were the idols of the vulgar — a hard, cruel, sensual vulgar; the ivories, as it were talismans, of the hardly less superstitious, but more opulent, and polished; of those who kept up, some the love of letters, some more cultivated tastes. Even the illuminations were the quiet works of the gentler and better and more civilized Monks: their love and their study of the Holy Books was the testimony and the means of their superior refinement.

quarters, these better qualities cease to be the secret indulgences, the life-long labors of the emblazoner of manuscripts, the illuminator of missals. In the higher branches of the art, the names of artists gradually begin to transpire, to obtain respect and fame; the sure sign that art is beginning, that mere technical traditionary working at images for popular worship is drawing to its close. Already the names of Guido of Sienna, Giunto of Pisa, and of Cimabue, resound through Christendom. Poetry hails the birth and the youth of her sister art.

Such, according to the best authorities, appears to have been the state of painting from the iconoclastic controversy throughout the darker ages. Faintly and hesitatingly at the commencement of the twelfth century,¹ more boldly and vigorously towards its close, and during the thirteenth and half the fourteenth, Italian painting rose by degrees, threw off with Giotto the last trammels of Byzantinism which had still clung around Cimabue; and at least strove after that exquisite harmony of nature and of art, which had still great progress to make before it reached its consummation. Turn from the vast, no doubt majestic Redeemer of Cimabue, which broods, with its attendant figures of the Virgin and St. John, over the high altar at Pisa, Giotto, born 1276, died 1336. to the free creations of Giotto at Florence or Padua. Giotto was the great deliverer.

¹ "Mir selbst aber ist es während vieljähriger Nachforschung durchaus nicht gelungen, irgend ein Beispiel des Wiederaufstrebens und Fortschreitens der Italienischen Kunstübung auszufinden, dessen Alter den Anbeginn des zwölften Jahrhunderts übersteige." — Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen*, i. p. 250.

For the works of the twelfth century, Kugler, pp. 9 *et seq.* Nevertheless full eighty years elapsed before this development made any further progress, p. 98. Sculpture in relief was earlier than Painting.

Invention is no sooner free than it expatiates in unbounded variety. Nothing more moves our wonder than the indefatigable activity, the unexhausted fertility of Giotto: he is adorning Italy from the Alps to the Bay of Naples; even crossing the Alps to Avignon. His works either exist or have existed at Avignon, Milan, Verona, Padua, Ferrara, Urbino, Ravenna, Rimini, Lucca, Florence, Assisi, Rome, Gaeta, Naples.¹ Bishops, religious orders, republics, princes and potentates, kings, popes, demand his services, and do him honor. He raises at once the most beautiful tower in architecture — that of Florence — and paints the Chapel of the Arena at Padua, and the Church at Assisi. Giotto was no monk, but, in its better sense, a man of the world. Profoundly religious in expression, in character, in aim; yet religious not merely as embodying all the imagery of the mediæval faith, but as prophetic, at least, if not presentient of a wider Catholicism.² Besides the Scriptural subjects, in which he did not entirely depart from the Byzantine or earlier arrangement, and all the more famous Legends, he opened a new world of real and of allegorical beings. The poetry of St. Francis had impersonated everything; not merely, therefore, did the life of St. Francis offer new and picturesque subjects, but the impersona-

¹ Rio says, perhaps too strongly, that *all* his works at Avignon, Milan, Verona, Ferrara, Modena, Ravenna, Lucca, Gaeta, have perished, p. 65.

² There is great truth and beauty in the character of Giotto as drawn by Lord Lindsay (ii. p. 268). The three first paragraphs appear to me most striking and just. Lord Lindsay divides his life into four periods. I. His youth in Florence and Rome. II. About A. D. 1306 in Lombardy, the Arena Chapel at Padua. III. Assisi. IV. Longer residence in Florence, North of Italy, Avignon, Naples, p. 165. See also Mr. Ruskin's Memoir. For Giotto's remarkable Poem against voluntary poverty, see Rumohr, l. c. 9.

tions, Chastity, Obedience, Poverty, as in the hymns of St. Francis they had taken being, assumed form from Giotto. Religious led to civil allegory. Giotto painted the commonwealth of Florence. Allegory in itself is far too unobjective for art: it needs perpetual interpretation, which art cannot give; but it was a sign of the new world opening, or rather boldly thrown open, to painting by Giotto. The whole Scripture, the whole of Legend (not the old permitted forms and scenes alone), the life of the Virgin, of the Saints, of the founders of Orders, even the invisible worlds which Dante had revealed in poetry, now expanded in art. Dante, perhaps, must await Orcagna, not indeed actually to embody, but to illustrate his transmundane worlds. Italy herself hailed, with all her more powerful voices — her poets, novelists, historians — the new epoch of art in Giotto. Dante declares that he has dethroned Cimabue. “The vulgar,” writes Petrarch, “cannot understand the surpassing beauty of Giotto’s Virgin, before which the masters stand in astonishment.” “Giotto,” says Boccaccio, “imitates nature to perfect illusion;” Villani describes him as transcending all former artists in the truth of nature.¹

During the latter half of the thirteenth, and throughout the fourteenth century, the whole of Italy, the churches, the monasteries, the cloisters, many of the civil buildings, were covered with paintings aspiring after, and approximating to the highest art. Sienna, then in the height of her glory and prosperity, took the lead;

¹ Credette Cimabue nella pittura
Tener lo campo, ed or’ ha Giotto il grido.

Mitto tabulam meam beatæ Virginis, operis Joeti pictoris egregii in cujus pulcritudinem ignorantes nec intelligunt, magistri autem artis stupent.
Quoted by Vasari. Decameron, Giorn. vi. Nov. 5. Villani, 11, 12.

Pisa beheld her Campo Santo peopled with the wonderful creations of Orcagna. Painting aspired to her Inferno, Purgatorio, Paradiso: Painting will strive to have her Dante.

This outburst was simultaneous with, it might seem to originate in, the wide dissemination, the ubiquitous activity, and the strong religious passion felt, propagated, kept alive in its utmost intensity ^{Mendicant Orders.} by the Mendicant Orders. Strange it might appear that the Arts, the highest luxuries, if we may so speak, of religion, should be fostered, cultivated, cherished, distributed throughout Italy, and even beyond the Alps, by those who professed to reduce Christianity to more than its primitive simplicity, its nakedness of all adornment, its poverty; whose mission it was to consort with the most rude and vulgar; beggars who aspired to rank below the coarsest mendicancy; according to whose rule there could be no property, hardly a fixed residence. Strange! that these should become the most munificent patrons of art, the most consummate artists; that their cloistered palaces should be the most sumptuous in architecture, and the most richly decorated by sculpture and painting; at once the workshops and the abodes of those who executed most admirably, and might seem to adore with the most intense devotion, these splendors and extravagances of religious wealth. Assisi — the birthplace of St. Francis, the poor, self-denying wanderer over the face of the earth, who hardly owned the cord which girt him, who possessed not a breviary of his own, who worshipped in the barren mountain, at best in the rock-hewn cell, whose companions were the lepers, the outcasts of human society — Assisi becomes the capital, the young, gorgeous

capital of Christian Art. Perhaps in no single city of that period was such lavish expenditure made in all which was purely decorative. The church, finished by a German architect but five years after the death of St. Francis, put to shame in its architecture, as somewhat later in the paintings of Cimabue, Simon Memmi, Giunto, Giotto, probably the noblest edifices in Rome, those in the Lombard Republics, in Pisa, Sienna, Florence, and as yet those of the capitals and cathedral cities of Transalpine Christendom. The Dominicans were not far behind in their steady cultivation, and their profuse encouragement of art.¹

Yet this fact is easy of explanation, if it has not already found its explanation in our history. There is always a vast mass of dormant religiousness in the world; it wants only to be seized, stimulated, directed, appropriated. These Orders swept into their ranks and within their walls all who yearned for more intense religion. Devout men threw themselves into the movement, which promised most boldly and succeeded most fully in satisfying the cravings of the heart. There would be many whose vocation was not that of the active preacher, or the restless missionary, or the argute schoolman. There were the calm, the gentle, the contemplative. Men who had the irresistible calling to be artists became Franciscans or Dominicans, not because mendicancy was favorable to art, but because it awoke, and cherished, and strengthened those emotions which were to express themselves in art. Religion drove them into the cloister; the cloister and the church offered them its walls; they drew from all quarters the

¹ Simon Memmi of Sienna painted the legend of St. Dominic in the Chapel of the Spaniards in Santa Maria Novella at Florence. — Vasari and Rio, p. 55.

traditions, the technicalities of art. Being rich enough (the communities, not the individuals) to reward the best teachers or the more celebrated artists, they soon became masters of the skill, the manipulation, the rules of design, the practice of coloring. How could the wealth, so lavishly poured at their feet, be better employed than in the reward of the stranger-artist, who not only adorned their walls with the most perfect models, but whose study in the church or in the cloister was a school of instruction to the Monks themselves who aspired to be their pupils or their rivals?

The Monkish painters were masters of that invaluable treasure, time, to work their study up to perfection; there was nothing that urged to careless haste. Without labor they had their scanty but sufficient sustenance; they had no further wants. Art alternated with salutary rest, or with the stimulant of art, the religious service. Neither of these permitted the other to languish into dull apathy, or to rest in inexpressive forms or hues. No cares, no anxieties, probably not even the jealousies of art, intruded on these secluded Monks; theirs was the more blameless rivalry of piety, not of success. With some, perhaps, there was a latent unconscious pride, not so much in themselves as in the fame and influence which accrued to the Order, or to the convent, which their works crowded more and more with wondering worshippers. But in most it was to disburden, as it were, their own hearts, to express in form and color their own irrepressible feelings. They would have worked as passionately and laboriously if the picture had been enshrined, unvisited, in their narrow cell. They worshipped their own works, not because they were their

own, but because they spoke the language of their souls. They worshipped while they worked, worked that they might worship; and works so conceived and so executed (directly the fetters of conventionalism were burst and cast aside, and the technical skill acquired) could not fail to inspire the adoration of all kindred and congenial minds. Their pictures, in truth, were their religious offerings, made in single-minded zeal, with untiring toil, with patience never wearied or satisfied. If these offerings had their meed of fame, if they raised the glory or enlarged the influence and so the wealth of the Order, the simple artists were probably the last who would detect within themselves that less generous and less disinterested motive.

If the Dominicans were not inferior to the Franciscans in the generous encouragement of the art of painting, in its cultivation among their own brethren they attained higher fame. If Assisi took the lead, and almost all the best masters kindled its walls to life, the Dominican convent in Florence might boast the *Frà Angelico*. works of their own brother *Frà Angelico*. To judge from extant paintings, Angelico was the unsurpassed, if not unrivalled, model of what I presume to call the cloistral school of painting. The perfect example of his inspiration as of his art was *Frà Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole*. *Frà Angelico* became a monk that he might worship without disturbance, and paint without reward. He left all human passions behind him; his one passion was serene devotion, not without tenderness, but the tenderness of a saint rather than of a man. Before he began to paint, he knelt in prayer; as he painted the sufferings of the Redeemer, he would break off in tears. No doubt,

when he attained that expression of calm, unearthly holiness which distinguishes his Angels or Saints, he stood partaking in their mystic ecstasy. He had nothing of the moroseness, the self-torture of the monk ; he does not seem, like later monastic painters in Italy and Spain, to have delighted in the agony of the martyrdom ; it is the glorified, not the suffering, Saint which is his ideal. Of the world, it was human nature alone from which he had wrenched away his sympathies. He delights in brilliant colors ; the brightest green or the gayest hues in his trees and flowers ; the richest reds and blues in his draperies, with a profusion of gold. Frà Angelico is the Mystic of painting, the contemplative Mystic, living in another world, having transmuted all that he remembers of this world into a purer, holier being. But that which was his excellence was likewise his defect. It was spiritualism, exquisite and exalting spiritualism, but it was too spiritual. Painting, which represents humanity, even in its highest, holiest form, must still be human. With the passions, the sympathies and affections of Giovanni's mind had almost died away. His child is not a child, he is a cherub. The Virgin and the Mother are not blended in perfect harmony and proportion ; the colder Virgin prevails ; adoration has extinguished motherly love. Above all, the Redeemer fails in all Angelico's pictures. Instead of the orthodox perfect God and perfect Man, by a singular heresy the humanity is so effaced that, as the pure Divinity is unimaginable, and, unincarnate, cannot be represented, both the form and the countenance are stiffened to a cold, unmeaning abstraction. It is neither the human nature, with the infused majesty

and mercy of the Godhead; nor the Godhead subdued into the gentleness and patience of humanity. The God-man is neither God nor Man. Even in the celestial or beatified beings, angels or saints, exquisite, unrivalled as is their grace and beauty, the grace is not that of beings accustomed to the free use of their limbs; the beauty is not that of our atmosphere. Not merely do they want the breath of life, the motion of life, the warmth of life, they want the truth of life, and without truth there is no consummate art. They have never really lived, never assumed the functions nor dwelt within the precincts of life. Painting having acquired in the cloister all this unworldliness, this profound devotion, this refined spirituality, must emerge again into the world to blend and balance both, first in Francia and Perugino, up to the perfect Leonardo and Raffaëlle. Even the cloister in Frà Bartolomeo must take a wider flight; it must paint man, it must humanize itself that it may represent man and demand the genuine admiration of man. It is without the walls of the cloister that painting finds its unrivalled votaries, achieves its most imperishable triumphs.

Transalpine Painting is no less the faithful con-
Transalpine.
German and
Flemish art. servator of the ancient traditions. In the German missals and books of devotion there is, throughout the earlier period, the faithful maintenance of the older forms, rich grounds, splendid colors. The walls of the older churches reveal paintings in which there is at least aspiration after higher things, some variety of design, some incipient grace and nobleness of form. The great hierarchical cities on the Rhine seem to take the lead. William of Cologne

and Master Stephen seem as if they would raise up rivals in Teutonic to Italian art. Above all, at the close of this period, about contemporary with Angelico da Fiesole, the Flemish Van Eycks, if not by the invention, by the perfection of oil-painting, gave an impulse of which it is difficult to calculate the importance. Those painters of the rich commercial cities of the Low Countries might seem as deeply devout in their conceptions as the cloistral school of Italy, yet more human as living among men, nobler in their grouping, nobler in their dresses and draperies; and already in their backgrounds anticipating that truth and reality of landscape which was hereafter to distinguish their country. In this the later Flemish painters rise as much above the Van Eycks as Leonardo and Raffaello above their predecessors. But at first Teutonic might seem as if it would vie for the palm of Christian painting.¹

The works of Nicolas V. in letters and in arts have ended our survey of these two great departments of Christian influence, and summed up the account of Latin Christendom. The papacy of Nicolas V. closed the age of mediæval letters; it terminated, at least in Italy, if Brunelleschi had not already closed it, the reign of mediæval architecture.² In

¹ Hubert Van Eyck, born about 1366, died 1426. John Van Eyck, born about 1400, died 1445. — See for German Painting the Translation of Kugler, by Sir Edmund Head. On the Van Eycks, Waagen's Dissertation.

² Two sentences of Vasari show the revolution arrived at and taught by that great Architect, who boasted to have raised the majestic cupola of Florence. "Solo l' intento suo era l' architettura che gia era spenta, dico gli ordini antichi *buoni*, e non la *Tedesca e barbara* la quale molto si usava nel suo tempo. * * * E aveva in se due concetti grandissimi; l' uno era il tornare al luce la buona architettura, credendo egli ritrovandola non lasciare manco memoria di se, che fatto si aveva Cimabue e Giotto; l' altro di trovar modo, se e si potesse, a voltare la cupola di S. Maria del Fiore di Firenze," p. 207, edit. Milan. Compare p. 265.

painting, by his munificent patronage of that which was then the highest art, but which was only the harbinger of nobler things to come, the pontificate of Nicolas marked the transition period from the ancient to the modern world.

But Nicolas V. was only a restorer, and a restorer not in the hierarchical character, of the mediæval architecture. That architecture had achieved its great works, Strasburg, all that was to rise, till the present day, of Cologne, Antwerp, Rheims, Bruges, Amiens, Chartres, St. Ouen at Rouen, Notre Dame at Paris, our own Westminster, York, Salisbury, Lincoln. This great art survived in its creative power, only as it were, at the extremities of Latin Christendom. It had even passed its gorgeous epoch, called in France the Flamboyant; it was degenerating into luxury and wantonness; it had begun to adorn for the sake of adornment. But Rome was still faithful to Rome; her architecture would not condescend to Teutonic influence. That which is by some called Christian architecture, as has been said, was to the end almost a stranger in the city still acknowledged as the capital of Christendom.¹ Rome at least, if not Italy, was still holding aloof from that which was the strength of Rome and of Latin Christendom — Mediævalism; Nicolas V., as it were, accomplished the divorce. In him Rome repudiated the whole of what are called the Dark Ages. Rome began the revival which was to be in the end the ruin of her supremacy.

Nicolas V., as Pope, as sovereign of Rome, as

¹ It was in Rome that Brunelleschi "ritrovò le cornici antiche, e l'ordine Toscano, Corinthio, Dorico, e Ionico alle primarie forme restituiti." — Vasari.

patron of letters and arts, stood, consciously perhaps, but with a dim perception of the change, at the head of a new era. It was an epoch in Christian civilization. To him the Pope might seem as destined for long ages to rule the subject and tributary world; the great monarchies, the Empire, France, Spain, England, were yet to rise, each obedient or hostile to the Pope as might suit their policy. He could not foresee that the Pope, from the high autocrat over all, would become only one of the powers of Christendom. To be a sovereign Italian prince might appear necessary to his dignity, his security. It was but in accordance with the course of things in Italy. Everywhere, except in stern oligarchical Venice, in Milan, in Verona, in Ferrara, in Florence, princes had risen, or were arising, on the ruins of the Republics, Viscontis, Sforzas, Estes, della Scalas, Medicis. Thomas of Sarzana (he took this name, he had no other, from his native town) so obscure that his family was unknown, had no ancestry to glorify, no descendants whom he might be tempted to enrich or to ennoble. He had no prophetic fears that, as sovereign princes, his successors would yield to the inevitable temptation of founding princely families at the expense of the interests, of the estates and dominions of the Church. Not only was the successor of St. Peter to be merged in the more ambitious politics of the world, but trammelled in the more mean and intricate politics of Italy. Almost from this time the names of the successive Popes may be traced in the annals of the cities and petty principalities of Italy, in the rolls of the estates of the Church, of which they have become lords, in their

magnificent palaces in Rome. Among those palaces there is but one, the Colonna, which boasts an ancient name; but few which bear not the name of a papal house. Too often among the Popes of the next century the character (and dark indeed was that character) of the Italian sovereign prince prevailed over that of the Pope. If his house was not perpetuated, it was solely from the indignant hostility and execration of mankind.¹

As to Nicolas V. Italy, or rather Latin Christianity, mainly owes her age of learning, as well as its fatal consequences to Rome and to Latin Christianity, so those consequences, in his honest ardor, he would be the last to prognosticate or to foresee. It was the splendid vision of Nicolas V. that Christianity was to array herself in the spoils of the ancient world, and so maintain with more universal veneration her supremacy over the human mind. This, however, the revival of learning, was but one of the four great principles in slow, silent, irresistible operation in Western Christendom, mutually coöperative, blending with and strengthening each other, ominous of and preparing the great revolution of the next century. But to all these, signs at once and harbingers of the coming change, Nicolas could not but be blind; for of these signs some were those which a Pope, himself so pious and so prosperous, might refuse to see; or, if not dazzled by his prosperity, too entirely absorbed in dangers of far other kind, the fall of Constantinople, the advance of the Turks on Western Christendom, might be unable to see. This one danger, as it (so he might

¹ Pius II. alienated Radicofani, not to his family, but to his native city Sienna.

hope) would work reformation in the startled Church, would bring the alienated world into close and obedient confederacy with her head. The Pope, like Urban of old, would take his place at the head of the defensive crusade.

I. — Of these principles, of these particular signs, the first was the *progress of the human intellect*, inevitable in the order of things, and resulting in a twofold oppugnancy to the established dominion of the Church. The first offspring of the expanding intellect was the long-felt, still growing impatience, intolerance of the oppressions and the abuses of the Papacy, of the Papal Court, and of the Papal religion. This impatience did not of necessity involve the rejection of the doctrines of Latin Christianity. But it would no longer endure the enormous powers still asserted by the Popes over temporal sovereigns, the immunities claimed by the clergy as to their persons and from the common burdens of the State, the exorbitant taxation, the venality of Rome, above all, the Indulgences, with which the Papal power in its decline seemed determined wantonly to insult the moral and religious sense of mankind. Long before Luther this abuse had rankled in the heart of Christendom. It was in vain for the Church to assert that, rightly understood, Indulgences only released from temporal penances; that they were a commutation, a merciful, lawful commutation for such penances. The language of the promulgators and vendors of the Indulgences, even of the Indulgences themselves, was, to the vulgar ear, the broad, plain, direct guarantee from the pains of purgatory, from hell itself, for tens, hundreds, thousands of years; a sweeping pardon for all sins committed, a sweeping

license for sins to be committed : and if this false construction, it might be, was perilous to the irreligious, this even seeming flagrant dissociation of morality from religion was no less revolting to the religious.¹ Nor was there as yet any general improvement in the lives of the Clergy or of the Monks, which by its awful sanctity might rebuke the vulgar and natural interpretation of these Indulgences.² The antagonism of the more enlightened intellect to the *doctrines* of the mediæval Church was slower, more timid, more reluctant. It was as yet but doubt, suspicion, indifference ; the irreligious were content to be quietly irreligious ; the religious had not as yet found in the plain Biblical doctrines that on which they could calmly and contentedly rest their faith. Religion had not risen to a purer spirituality to compensate for the loss of the materialistic worship of the dominant Church. The conscience shrunk from the responsibility of taking cognizance of itself ; the soul dared not work out its own salvation. The clergy slept on the brink of the precipice. So long as they were not openly opposed they thought all was safe. So long as unbelief in the whole of their system lurked quietly in men's hearts, they cared not to inquire what was brooding in those inner depths.

II. — The second omen at once and sign of change was the cultivation of classical learning. Letters almost at once ceased to be cloistral, hie-

Revival of
Letters.

¹ Chaucer's Pardoner is a striking illustration of the popular notion and popular feeling in England.

² The irrefragable testimony to the universal misinterpretation, the natural, inevitable misinterpretation of the language of the Indulgences, the misinterpretation riveted on the minds of men by their profligate vendors, is the solemn, reiterated repudiation of those notions by Councils and by Popes. The definitions of the Council of Trent and of Pius V. had not been wanted, if the Church doctrine had been the belief of mankind.

rarchical, before long almost to be Christian. In Italy, indeed, the Pope had set himself at the head of this vast movement; yet Florence vied with Rome. Cosmo de' Medici was the rival of Nicolas V. But, notwithstanding the Pope's position, the clergy rapidly ceased to be the sole and almost exclusive depositaries of letters. The scholars might condescend to hold canonries or abbeys as means of maintenance, as honors, or rewards (thus, long before, had Petrarch been endowed), but it was with the tacit understanding, or at least the almost unlimited enjoyment, of perfect freedom from ecclesiastical control, so long as they did not avowedly enter on theological grounds, which they avoided rather from indifference and from growing contempt, than from respect. On every side were expanding new avenues of inquiry, new trains of thought: new models of composition were offering themselves; all tended silently to impair the reverence for the ruling authorities. Men could not labor to write like Cicero and Cæsar without imbibing something of their spirit. The old ecclesiastical Latin began to be repudiated as rude and barbarous. Scholasticism had crushed itself with its own weight. When monks or friars were the only men of letters, and monastic schools the only field in which intellect encountered intellect, the huge tomes of Aquinas, and the more summary axioms of Peter Lombard, might absorb almost the whole active mind of Christendom. But Plato now drove out the Theologic Platonism, Aristotle the Aristotelism of the schools. The Platonism, indeed, of Marsilius Ficinus, taking its interpretation rather from Proclus and Plotinus and the Alexandrians, would hardly have offended Julian himself by any ob-

trusive display of Christianity. On his death-bed Cosmo de' Medici is attended by Ficinus, who assures him of another life on the authority of Socrates, and teaches him resignation in the words of Plato, Xenocrates, and other Athenian sages. The cultivation of Greek was still more fatal to Latin domination. Even the familiar study of the Greek Fathers (as far as an imposing ritual and the monastic spirit consistent with those of the Latin Church) was altogether alien to the scholasticism dominant in Latin Theology. They knew nothing of the Latin supremacy, nothing of the rigid form, which many of its doctrines, as of Transubstantiation, had assumed. Greek revealed a whole religious world, extraneous to and in many respects oppugnant to Latin Christianity. But the most fatal result was the revelation of the Greek Testament, necessarily followed by that of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the dawn of a wider Biblical Criticism. The proposal of a new translation of the Scriptures at once disenthroned the Vulgate from its absolute exclusive authority. It could not but admit the Greek, and then the Hebrew, as its rival, as its superior in antiquity. Biblical Criticism once begun, the old voluminous authoritative interpreters, De Lyra, Turrecremata, Cornelius a Lapide, were thrown into obscurity. Erasmus was sure to come ; with Erasmus a more simple, clear, popular interpretation of the divine word.¹ The mystic and allegoric comment on the Scriptures, on which rested wholly some of the boldest assertions of Latin Christianity, fell away at once before his closer, more

¹ The Paraphrase and Notes of Erasmus, in my judgment, was the most important Book even of his day. We must remember that it was almost legally adopted by the Church of England.

literal, more grammatical study of the Text. At all events, the Vulgate receded, and with the Vulgate Latin Christianity began to withdraw into a separate sphere; it ceased to be the sole, universal religion of Western Christendom.

III. — The growth of the modern languages not merely into vernacular means of communication, but into the vehicles of letters, of poetry, ^{Modern Languages.} of oratory, of history, of preaching, at length of national documents, still later of law and of science, threw back Latin more and more into a learned dialect. It was relegated into the study of the scholar, into books intended for the intercommunication only of the learned, and for a certain time for the negotiations and treaties of remote kingdoms, who were forced to meet on some common ground. It is curious that in Italy the revival of classical learning for a time crushed the native literature, or at least retarded its progress. From Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, to Ariosto and Machiavelli, excepting some historians, Malespina, Dino Compagni, Villani, there is almost total silence: silence, at least, unbroken by any powerful voice. Nor did the liberal patronage of Nicolas V. call forth one work of lasting celebrity in the native tongue. The connection of the development of the Transalpine, more especially the Teutonic languages, has been already examined more at length. Here it may suffice to resume, that the vernacular translation of the Bible was an inevitable result of the perfection of those tongues. In Germany and in England that translation tended most materially, by fixing a standard in general of vigorous, noble, poetic, yet idiomatic language, to hasten, to perpetuate the change. It was natural that as soon as a nation had

any books of its own, it should seek to have the Book of Books. The Church, indeed, trembling for the supremacy of her own Vulgate, and having witnessed the fatal perils of such Translations in the successes of all the earlier Dissidents, was perplexed and wavered in her policy. Now she thundered out her awful prohibition ; now endeavored herself to supply the want which would not remain unsatisfied, by a safer and a sanctioned version. But the mind of man could not wait on her hesitating movements. The free, bold, untrammelled version had possession of the national mind and national language ; it had become the undeniable patrimony of the people, the standard of the language.

IV.— Just at this period the two great final Re-
Printing and Paper. formers, the inventor of printing and the manufacturer of paper, had not only commenced, but perfected at once their harmonious inventions. Books, from slow, toilsome, costly productions, became cheap, were multiplied with rapidity which seemed like magic, and were accessible to thousands to whom manuscripts were utterly unapproachable. The power, the desire, increased with the facility of reading. Theology, from an abstruse recondite science, the exclusive possession of an Order, became popular ; it was, ere long, the general study, the general passion. The Preacher was not sought the less on account of this vast extension of his influence. His eloquent words were no longer limited by the walls of a Church, or the power of a human voice ; they were echoed, perpetuated, promulgated over a kingdom, over a continent. The fiery Preacher became a pamphleteer ; he addressed a whole realm ; he addressed mankind. It was no longer necessary that man should act directly

upon man ; that the flock should derive their whole knowledge from their Pastor, the individual Christian from his ghostly adviser. The man might find satisfaction for his doubts, guidance for his thoughts, excitement for his piety in his own chamber from the silent pages of the theological treatise. To many the Book became the Preacher, the Instructor, even the Confessor. The conscience began to claim the privilege, the right, of granting absolution to itself. All this, of course, at first timidly, intermittingly, with many compunctious returns to the deserted fold. The Hierarchy endeavored to seize and bind down to their own service these unruly powers. Their presses at Venice, at Florence, at Rome, displayed the new art in its highest magnificence ; but it was not the splendid volume, the bold and majestic type, the industrious editorial care, which worked downwards into the depths of society ; it was the coarse, rude, brown sheet ; the ill-cut German type ; the brief, sententious, plain tract, which escaped all vigilance, which sunk untraced, unanswered, unconfuted, into the eager mind of awakening man. The sternest vigilance might be exercised by the Argus-eyes of the still ubiquitous Clergy. The most solemn condemnations, the most awful prohibitions might be issued ; yet from the birthday of printing, their sole exclusive authority over the mind of man was gone. That they rallied and resumed so much power ; that they had the wisdom and the skill to seize upon the education of mankind, and to seal up again the outbursting springs of knowledge, and free examination, is a mighty marvel. Though from the rivals, the opponents, the foes, the subjugators of the great Temporal Despots, they became, by their yet powerful hold on

the conscience, and by their common interests in keeping mankind in slavery, their allies, their ministers, their rulers ; yet, from that hour, the Popes must encounter more dangerous, pertinacious, unconquerable antagonists than the Hohenstaufens and Bavarians, the Henrys and Fredericks of old. The sacerdotal caste must recede from authority to influence. Here they would mingle into the general mass of society, assimilate themselves to the bulk of mankind, become citizens, subjects, fathers of families, and fulfilling the common duties and relations of life, work more profoundly beneficial, moral, and religious effects. There they would still stand in a great degree apart, as a separate, unmingling order, yet submit to public opinion, if exercising control, themselves under strong control. This great part of the sacerdotal order at a much later period was to be stripped with ruder and more remorseless hands of their power, their rank, their wealth ; they were to be thrust down from their high places, to become stipendiaries of the state. Their great strength, Monasticism, in some kingdoms was to be abolished by law, which they could not resist ; or it was only tolerated as useful to the education, and to the charitable necessities of mankind ; almost everywhere it sunk into desuetude, or lingered as the last earthly resort of the world-weary and despondent, the refuge of a rare fanaticism, which now excites wonder rather than widespread emulation. From Nicolas V., seated, as it were, on its last summit, the Papal power, the Hierarchical system, commences its visible decline. Latin Christianity had to cede a large portion of its realms, which became the more flourishing, prosperous, intellectual portion of the world, to Teutonic Christianity. It had

hereafter to undergo more fierce and fiery trials. But whatever may be its future doom, one thing may be asserted without fear, it can never again be the universal Christianity of the West.

I pretend not to foretell the future of Christianity; but whosoever believes in its perpetuity (and to disbelieve it were treason against its Divine Author, apostasy from his faith) must suppose that, by some providential law, it must adapt itself, as it has adapted itself with such wonderful versatility, but with a faithful conservation of its inner vital spirit, to all vicissitudes and phases of man's social, moral, intellectual being. There is no need to discuss a recent theory (of M. Comte) that man is to become all intellect; and that religion, residing rather in the imagination, the affections, and the conscience, is to wither away, and cede the whole dominion over mankind to what is called "positive philosophy." I have no more faith in the mathematical millennium of M. Comte (at all events we have centuries enough to wait for it) than in the religious millennium of some Judaizing Christians.

Latin Christianity or Papal Christianity (which is Latin Christianity in its full development), whatever it may be called with least offence, has not only ceased to be, it can never again be, the exclusive, the paramount, assuredly not the universal religion of enlightened men. The more advanced the civilization, no doubt, in a certain sense, the more need of Christianity. All restrictive views, therefore, of Christianity, especially if such Christianity be at issue with the moral sense, and with the progressive reason of man, are urged with perilous and fearful responsibility. Better Christianity vague in creed, defective in polity,

than no Christianity. If Latin Christianity were to be the one perpetual, immutable, unalterable code, how much of the world would still be openly, how much secretly without religion? Even in what we may call the Latin world, to how large a part is Latin Christianity what the religion of old Rome was in the days of Cæsar and Cicero, an object of traditionary and prudential respect, of vast political importance, an edifice of which men fear to see the ruin, yet have no inward sense of its foundation in truth? On more religious minds it will doubtless maintain its hold as a religion of authority — a religion of outward form — an objective religion, and so possessing inexhaustible powers of awakening religious emotion. As a religion of authority, as an objective religion, as an emotional religion, it may draw within its pale proselytes of congenial minds from a more vague, more subjective, more rational faith. As a religion of authority it spares the soul from the pain of thought, from the harassing doubt, the desponding scruple. Its positive and peremptory assurances not only overawe the weak, but offer an indescribable consolation — a rest, a repose, which seems at least to be peace. Independence of thought, which to some is their holiest birthright, their most glorious privilege, their sternest duty, is to others the profoundest misery, the heaviest burden, the responsibility from which they would shrink with the deepest awe, which they would plunge into any abyss to avoid. What relief to devolve upon another the oppressive question of our eternal destiny!

As an objective religion, a materialistic religion, a religion which addresses itself to the senses of man Latin Christianity has no less great and enduring

power. To how many is there no reality without bodily form, without at least the outline, the symbol suggestive of bodily form! With the vulgar, at least it does not rebuke the rudest, coarsest superstition; for the more educated, the symbol refines itself almost to spirituality.

With a large part of mankind, a far larger no doubt of womankind, whose sensibilities are in general more quick and intense than the reasoning faculties, Christian emotion will still either be the whole of religion, or the measure, and the test of religion. Doubtless some primary elements of religion seem intuitive, and are anterior to, or rise without the consciousness of any reasoning process, whose office it is to confirm and strengthen them — the existence of God and of the Infinite, Divine Providence, the religious sense of right and wrong, retribution; more or less vaguely the immortality of the soul. Other doctrines will ever be assumed to be as eternal and immutable. With regard to these, the religious sentiment, which lives upon religious emotion, will be as reluctant to appeal to the slow, cold verdict of the judgment. Their evidence is their power of awakening, keeping alive, and rendering more intense the feeling, the passion of reverence, of adoration, of awe and love. To question them is impiety; to examine them perilous imprudence; to reject them misery, the most dreary privation. Emotional religion — and how large a part of the religion of mankind is emotional! — refuses any appeal from itself.

Latin Christianity, too, will continue to have a firmer hold on the nations of Latin descent; of those whose languages have a dominant affinity with the Latin. It

is not even clear whether it may not have some secret charm for those instructed in Latin ; at all events, with them the religious language of Latin Christianity being more intelligible, hardly more than an antiquated and sacred dialect of their own, will not so peremptorily demand its transference into the popular and vernacular tongue.

But that which is the strength of Latin Christianity in some regions, in some periods, with some races, with some individual minds, is in other lands, times, nations, and minds its fatal, irremediable principle of decay and dissolution ; and must become more so with the advancement of mankind in knowledge, especially in historical knowledge. That authority which is here a sacred, revered despotism, is there an usurpation, an intolerable tyranny. The Teutonic mind never entirely threw off its innate independence. The long feuds of the Empire and the Papacy were but a rude and premature attempt at emancipation from a yoke to which Rome had submitted her conqueror. Had the Emperors not striven for the mastery of the Latin world, had they stood aloof from Italy, even then the issue might have been different. A Teutonic Emperor had been a more formidable antagonist. But it is not the authority of the Pope alone, but that of the sacerdotal order, against which there is a deep, irresistible insurrection in the Teutonic mind. Men have begun to doubt, men are under the incapacity of believing, men have ceased to believe, the absolutely indispensable necessity of the intervention of any one of their fellow-creatures between themselves and the mercy of God. They cannot admit that the secret of their eternal destination is undeniably confided to another ; that they

must walk not by the light of their own conscience, but by foreign guidance; that the Clergy are more than messengers with a mission to keep up, with constant reiteration, the truths of the Gospel, to be prepared by special study for the interpretation of the sacred writings, to minister in the simpler ordinances of religion; that they have absolute power to release from sins: without omniscience to act in the place of the Omniscient. This, which, however disguised or softened off, is the doctrine of Latin, of mediæval, of Papal Christianity, has become offensive, presumptuous; to the less serious, ludicrous. Of course, as the relative position of the Clergy, once the sole masters of almost all intellectual knowledge, law, history, philosophy, has totally changed, their lofty pretensions jar more strongly against the common-sense of man. Even the interpretation of the sacred writings is no secret and esoteric doctrine, no mystery of which they are the sole and exclusive hierophants.

Toleration, in truth — toleration, which is utterly irreconcilable with the theory of Latin Christianity — has been forced into the mind and heart of Christendom, even among many whose so-called immutable creed is in its irrevocable words as intolerant as ever. What was proclaimed boldly, nakedly, without reserve, without limitation, and as implicitly believed by little less than all mankind, is now, in a large part of the civilized world, hardly asserted except in the heat of controversy, or from a gallant resolution not to shrink from logical consequences. Wherever publicly avowed or maintained, it is thought but an odious adherence to ignorant bigotry. It is believed by a still-diminishing few that Priest, Cardinal, Pope has the power of ir-

revocably predeclaring the doom of his fellow-men. Though the Latin Church-language may maintain its unmitigated severity, it is eluded by some admitted reservation, some implied condition utterly at variance with the peremptory tone of the old anathema. Excommunication is obsolete; the interdict on a nation has not been heard for centuries; even the proscription of books is an idle protest.

The subjective, more purely internal, less demonstrative character of Teutonic religion is equally impatient of the more distinct and definite, and rigid objectiveness of Latin Christianity. That which seems to lead the Southern up to heaven, the regular intermediate ascending hosts of Saints, Martyrs, Apostles, the Virgin, to the contemplative Teuton obscures and intercepts his awful, intuitive sense of the Godhead, unspiritualizes his Deity, whom he can no longer worship as pure Spirit. To him it is the very vagueness, vastness, incomprehensibility of his conception of the Godhead which proclaims its reality. If here God must be seen on the altar in a materialized form, at once visible and invisible; if God must be working a perpetual miracle; if the passive spirit must await the descent of the Godhead in some sensible sign or symbol; — there, on the other hand (especially as the laws of nature become better known and more familiar, and what of old seemed arbitrary variable agencies are become manifest laws), the Deity as it were recedes into more unapproachable majesty. It may indeed subtilize itself into a metaphysical First Cause, may expand into a dim Pantheism, but with the religious his religion still rests in a wise and sublime and revered system of Providential government which implies the Divine Personality.

Latin, the more objective faith, tends to materialism, to servility, to blind obedience or blind guidance, to the tacit abrogation, if not the repudiation, of the moral influence by the undue elevation of the dogmatic and ritual part. It is prone to become, as it has become, Paganism with Christian images, symbols, and terms; it has, in its consummate state, altogether set itself above and apart from Christian, from universal morality, and made what are called works of faith the whole of religion: the religion of the murderer, who, if while he sheathes his dagger in the heart of his victim, he does homage to an image of the Virgin, is still religious; ¹ the religion of the tyrant, who, if he retires in Lent to sackcloth and ashes, may live the rest of the year in promiscuous concubinage, and slaughter his subjects by thousands. So Teutonic Christianity, more self-depending, more self-guided, more self-wrought out, is not without its peculiar dangers. It may become self-sufficient, unwarrantably arrogant, impatient not merely of control, but of all subordination, incapable of just self-estimation. It will have a tendency to isolate the man, either within himself or as a member of a narrow sect, with all the evils of sectarianism, blind zeal, obstinate self-reliance, or rather self-adoration, hatred, contempt of others, moroseness, exclusiveness, fanaticism, undue appreciation of small things. It will have its own antinomianism, a dissociation of that moral and religious perfection of man which is Christianity; it will appeal to conscious direct influences of Divine Grace with as much confidence, and as little discrimination or judgment, as the

¹ Read what Mr. Coleridge used to call the sublime of Roman Catholic Antinomianism. Calderon, *Devocion de la Cruz*.

Latin to that through the intermediate hierarchy and ritual of the Church.

Its intellectual faith will be more robust; nor will its emotional be less profound and intense. But the strength of its intellectual faith (and herein is at once its glory and its danger) will know no limits to its daring speculation. How far Teutonic Christianity may in some parts already have gone almost or absolutely beyond the pale of Christianity, how far it may have lost itself in its unrebuked wanderings, posterity only will know. What distinctness of conception, what precision of language, may be indispensable to true faith; what part of the ancient dogmatic system may be allowed silently to fall into disuse, as at least superfluous, and as beyond the proper range of human thought and human language; how far the Sacred records may, without real peril to their truth, be subjected to closer investigation; to what wider interpretation, especially of the Semitic portion, those records may submit, and wisely submit, in order to harmonize them with the irrefutable conclusions of science; how far the Eastern veil of allegory which hangs over their truth may be lifted or torn away to show their unshadowed essence; how far the poetic vehicle through which truth is conveyed may be gently severed from the truth; — all this must be left to the future historian of our religion. As it is my own confident belief that the words of Christ, and his words alone (the primal, indefeasible truths of Christianity), shall not pass away; so I cannot presume to say that men may not attain to a clearer, at the same time more full and comprehensive and balanced sense of those words, than has as yet been generally received

in the Christian world. As all else is transient and mutable, these only eternal and universal, assuredly, whatever light may be thrown on the mental constitution of man, even on the constitution of nature, and the laws which govern the world, will be concentrated so as to give a more penetrating vision of those undying truths. Teutonic Christianity (and this seems to be its mission and privilege), however nearly in its more perfect form it may already have approximated, may approximate still more closely to the absolute and perfect faith of Christ; it may discover and establish the sublime unison of religion and reason; keep in tone the triple-chorded harmony of faith, holiness, and charity; assert its own full freedom, know the bounds of that freedom, respect the freedom of others. Christianity may yet have to exercise a far wider, even if more silent and untraceable influence, through its primary, all-penetrating, all-pervading principles, on the civilization of mankind.

INDEX.

ABBREVS.

A.

Abbeys plundered by great prelates, iii. 836. Property of, viii. 152.
Abdication, Papal. See Coelestine V.
Abellard, iv. 180. His birth and youth, 198. At Paris, 197. His theology, 199. Flight with Heloise, 202. Marriage and mutilation, 203. Resumes lectures, 204. His treatise on the Trinity condemned by Council of Soissons, 205. His contest with monks of St. Denys, 206. Wounds "The Paraclete," 207. Abbot of St. Gild's in Brittany, 209. His letters, 210. Challenge to St. Bernard, 211. Appeals to Rome, 214. Is condemned at Rome, 218. Protected at Clugny, 219. His death and burial at the Paraclete, 220. Opinions, 221. "Sic et Non," 224.
Absolute poverty, question of, vii. 56. Asserted by Franciscan Chapter of Perugia, 58.
Absolution, form of, among Templars, vi. 458.
Abubeker, successor of Mohammed, ii. 150.
Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, overthrows Basiliscus, i. 822. His power and ambition, 825. Disputes Roman supremacy, 826. His strife with Pope Felix, 831.
Acerra, Thomas of, v. 851.
Adalberon, Bishop of Laon, iii. 206.
Adalbert, son of Berengar, iii. 174. Takes refuge with Saracens, 179. His league with Pope John XII., 180.
Adalbert II. (the Rich), Marquis of Tuscany, iii. 156. Marries Bertha — defeated by Lambert, 156. His power, 157.
Adalbert of Bremen, iii. 833. His influence over Henry IV., 834. Combination against, 838. Fall of, 839, 840.
Adelaide, Empress, accuses Henry IV., iii. 519, 520.

AFRICA.

Adelaide, widow of Lothair, persecuted by Berengar — marries Otho the Great, iii. 176.
Adelchis, son of Desiderius, ii. 448. Obtains aid from Constantinople, 452.
Adelgis, Duke of Benevento, iii. 87.
Adeodatus, Pope, ii. 288.
Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, Papal Legate in Crusade, iv. 43.
Adolph of Nassau, vi. 231. King of Romans, 232. Conditions of his election, 233. His alliance with England, 235. Slain in battle, 236.
Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne, deposed, iv. 519. Restored, 534.
Adoptians, sect of, ii. 499.
Adrianople, battle of, v. 123.
Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II.), vii. 565. His secret influence, viii. 64. Parentage and youth, 66. His journey to England and Scotland, 67. Immortality, 72. At Basle, 74. His History, 76. Hostility to Eugenius IV., 76. Recovers from the plague, 78. Secretary to Felix V., 80. Secretary to Emperor, 81. His time-serving, 82. In holy orders, 84. Letters of, 86. Comes round to Eugenius, 87. His mission to Italy, 88. Apology to Pope, 89. Made Papal Secretary, 90. At Frankfurt — his journey to Rome, 91. Again at Frankfurt, 94. His danger and conduct, 95. Gains over Diet to the Pope, 96. Made Bishop of Trieste, 98. At Milan, 103. At Tabor in Bohemia, 109. Bishop of Sienna, 109. Legate in Germany, 114. His dread of Turks, 118. Popedom and character, 120. Letter to Mahomet II., 121. Zeal against Turks, 122.
Africa, the parent of Latin Christianity, i. 57. Importance of to Latin Empire, 261. Suffers from Donatist schism, 262. Cruelties of the Vandals in, 458. Conquest by Belisarius, 455. Retains Donatist heresy, ii. 66. Mohammedan conquest of, 162.

AFRICAN.

- African Church*, its relations with Roman See, i. 263. Its difficulties, 264. Asserts independence of Rome, 267. Sufferings of under Vandals, 269. Its reduced state (11th century), iii. 894.
- Agapetus*, Pope, ambassador to Constantinople, i. 459. His reception, 459. Dispute with Justinian, 460. Triumph and death, 461.
- Agatho*, Pope, ii. 283.
- Agilulph*, King of Lombards, ii. 77. Attacks Rome, 77.
- Agnes*, Empress, guardian of Henry IV., iii. 290. Weak position of, 328. Her monastic feelings, 497.
- Agnes of Meran* marries Philip Augustus, iv. 541, 542. Her separation, 552. Dies, 554.
- Aidan*, Bishop of Lindisfarne, ii. 192.
- Ailly*, Peter d', Cardinal of Cambray, his mission to rival popes — at Rome, vii. 283. At Avignon, 284. His sermon at Constance, 448. Extends right of suffrage, 459.
- Aiscelin*, Gilles d', Archbishop of Narbonne, vi. 423.
- Aix-la-Chapelle*, ii. 472.
- Aix-la-Chapelle*, Diet of, ii. 517. Legislates for the Church, 520. Its independence of Rome, 520. Settles the succession to the empire, 522, 523.
- Alaimo de Lentini* defends Messina, vi. 160, 164.
- Alaric* defeated by Stilicho, i. 144. His second invasion of Italy, 148. Besieges Rome, 148. Accepts ransom, 150. Sets up Attalus, as Emperor, 152. His final capture of Rome, 153. Spares Christian churches and sacred vessels, 156.
- Alberic*, son of Marozia, iii. 169. Rises against Hugh of Provence — Lord of Rome, 169. His rule and death, 174.
- Alberic da Romano* tortured to death, vi. 54.
- Albert of Austria*, letter of Gregory IX. to, v. 387.
- Albert of Austria*, Emperor, vi. 231. Defeats Adolph of Nassau, 233. Excommunicated, 237. Alliance of with Philip the Fair, 303. Reconciliation with Pope, 330. His oath, 331. Murdered, 412.
- Albert of Austria*, King of the Romans, viii. 77.
- Albert von Beham*, v. 488, 489.
- Albert*, Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 103.
- Albert the Great*, viii. 249, 254. His birth and teaching, 257. His learning — lectures on Aristotle, 259. Theology of, 260. Philosophy, 265.
- Albi*, heresies in, v. 147.
- Albigensian war*, v. 185. Innocent III.'s conduct in, 279.

ALFRED.

- Albigensians*. See Waldenses.
- Albinus*, i. 437.
- Alboin*, ii. 74. His death, 74.
- Albornoz*, Cardinal, legate in Italy, vii. 203. Appoints Rienzi senator, 206. Restores Papal power, 207. Receives Urban V. in Italy — his death, 216.
- Alcuin*, ii. 508.
- Aldfrid*, King of Northumbria, his disputes with Wilfrid, ii. 219. His remorse and death, 221.
- Aldhelm* of Malmesbury, ii. 230.
- Alexander II.* (Anselm of Badagio), ii. 812. Resists marriage of clergy, 316. Elected Pope by Cardinals, 321. Defeated by Cadalona, 327. His election confirmed at Augsburg, 332; and at Mantua, 341. Dies, 353. Sanctions Norman invasion of England, 392.
- Alexander III.*, Pope, disputed election of, iv. 288. Excommunicates Frederick Barbarossa, 298. His voyage to France, 294. His relations with Becket, 295. Holds council at Tours, 327. Absolves Becket, 340. His embarrassment and hesitation, 341, 376, 393. Gains possession of Rome, 386. Suspend Becket's sentences, 376, 383. Absolves Bishops of London and Salisbury, 399. His connection with Becket's career, 426. Reception of, at Rome, 427. Makes peace with Emperor at Venice, 433. His death, 438.
- Alexander IV.*, Pope, vi. 41. Exiles English against Manfred, 43. His contest with Brancalcione, 48. His antipathy to Manfred, 51. Favors friars, 68. His Bull to University of Paris, 70. His death, 80.
- Alexander V.*, his obscure origin, vii. 330. Favors Franciscans, 321. His Bull in favor of friars, 323. Murmurs against, 326. His death, 328.
- Alexander the Mason*, councillor of King John, v. 31.
- Alexandria*, quarrels at, i. 316.
- Alexandria* (in Piedmont), its foundation, iv. 431, 433.
- Alexius Comnenus*, his jealousy of Crusaders, iv. 40.
- Alexius Comnenus the Elder*, deposes and blinds his brother Isaac, v. 98. His flight, 103.
- Alexius Comnenus the Younger*, escapes from prison — flies to Rome, v. 92. Appeals to Crusaders at Venice, 92. His treaty with Crusaders at Zara, 99.
- Alfonso of Castile*, vi. 109.
- Alfonso*, King of Leon, v. 63.
- Alfonso*, King of Arragon, vi. 171. His treaty with Charles the Lame, 173. His death, 177.
- Alfonso*, of Arragon, viii. 63.
- Alfred* anointed by the Pope, iii. 143, 144.

A. A.

His wars, 144. Compels Guthrum to be baptized, 145. Learns to read, 146. His love of Saxon books, 147. Continues poems of Caedmon — his translations from Latin, 147.

Ali, Mohammed's second convert, ii. 125, 126. His honor and loyalty, 151.

Allegorical paintings, vii. 180

Allegory, viii. 379.

Alliterative verse, viii. 371.

Alsace, desolation of, ii. 233.

Altman, Bishop of Passau, iii. 419. Papal legate at Tribur, 447.

Amadeus of Savoy. See *Felix V.*

Amalasuntha, widow of Theodoric, marries Theodotus, i. 456. Put to death, 456.

Amatory poetry, monkish, viii. 321.

Amaury de Bene, viii. 247.

Ambrose, St., of Milan, i. 122, 123. His authority quoted for marriage of clergy, iii. 313.

Ammianus, i. 109.

Ananour, St., William, resists Friars, vi. 69. His "Perils of the Last Times," 74. His exile and popularity, 75.

Anacletus II., Antipope, iv. 158. Holds St. Angelo, 178. His death, 174.

Anacreontics, religious, viii. 320.

Anagni threatened by Romans, vi. 48. Boniface VIII. at, 547. Betrays Pope, 552. Rescues him, 555. Cardinals at, vii. 240.

Anastasius, Emperor, i. 332. Enforces toleration, 333. Deposes Bishop Euphemius, 334. His alleged Manicheism, 337. Dispute with Macedonius, 338. Critical position of, 340. His humiliation, 343. Appeals to Pope Hormisdas, 423. Rejects conditions, 427, 428. His death, 429.

Anastasius I., Pope, i. 124.

Anastasius II., Pope, his leniency, i. 349. His death — his memory detested, 350.

Anastasius IV., Pope, iv. 233.

Anastasius, Bishop of Constantinople, his intrigues for Artavasdus, ii. 324. His punishment, 326.

Ancona, siege of, iv. 428.

Andrew's, St., head, viii. 220.

Andrew, King of Hungary, his conversion, iii. 272. His war with Henry III., 272.

Andrew, King of Hungary, v. 71. Grants Golden Bull, 72. His crusade, 237.

Andrew of Hungary murdered, vii. 148.

Andronicus, Greek Emperor, restores independence of Greek Church, vi. 137.

Angelo, St., siege of, vii. 203.

Angels, belief regarding, ii. 94; viii. 189, 278. Orders of, 192.

Anglo-Norman hierarchy, iv. 304.

Anglo-Saxon Christianity, vii. 333.

Anglo-Saxon Christian poetry, ii. 230.

ARABIA.

Anglo-Saxon Church, divisions in, ii. 196. Monasticism of, 206.

Anglo-Saxon clergy, decay of, iv. 298. Resist Roman clergy, 300.

Anglo-Saxon language, viii. 382.

Anglo-Saxon missionaries, viii. 364.

Anglo-Saxons, their heathenism, ii. 176. Expel Christianity from Britain, 176. Civilized by Christianity, 198. Their reverence for Rome, 200. Church music among, 231, 232. Their laws, 232, 233. Their bishoprics, 233, 234. Christianity of, iv. 298.

Annates, vii. 270, 518, 519.

Anne of Bohemia, vii. 404.

Anskar, his visions, iii. 136, 137. His mission to Denmark, 139; to Sweden, 139. Archbishop of Hamburg, 139.

Anselm of Badagio. See *Alexander II.*

Anselm, Bishop of Luoca, iii. 490.

Anselm, St., at Bec, iv. 193. His philosophy, 194. Archbishop of Canterbury — resists the crown, 303. Was premature, viii. 237.

Anspert, Archbishop of Milan, iii. 96, 305.

Anthemius, Emperor of the West, i. 313.

Anthimus, Bishop of Constantinople, opposed by Agapetus and degraded, i. 480.

Anthropomorphism of popular Christianity, viii. 188, 261.

Antioch, disturbances in, i. 318, 335.

Antisacerdotalism, v. 135. Spreads among burghers, 140. In South of France, 147.

Antisacerdotalists, Biblical, v. 149.

Antonina degrades Pope Silverius, i. 463.

Antonius, Bishop of Fussola, i. 264. His appeal to the Pope, 264.

Antony of Padua, a Franciscan, v. 270. His preaching, 271.

Apianus presbyter at Sicca, i. 235. Deposed — appeals to Pope Zosimus, 235. Confesses his guilt, 237.

Apostles of Parma, vii. 39, 42.

Appeal to Rome, arose out of provincial jealousies, i. 270. Subjected to royal consent, iv. 393.

Apulia, war in, v. 370. Conspiracy in, against Frederick II., 484.

Aquinas, Thomas, death of, vi. 130. One of five great Schoolmen, viii. 254. His early life, 265. His authority, death, and canonization, 237. His "Sum of Theology," 237. His opinions, 268. His philosophy, 269, 272.

Arabia, independence and supposed wealth of, ii. 110. United under Mohammed, 133.

Arabian Jews, ii. 129, 130.

Arabic philosophy, viii. 243, 252. Schools, 245.

Arabic, translations from, viii. 249.

ARABS

- Arabs*, their immutable character, ii. 112, 113. Their love of war and rapine, 113.
- Arbon*, monastery of, ii. 244.
- Arch*, principle of, viii. 414.
- Architects*, ecclesiastic, viii. 431. Foreign, 443.
- Architecture*, Christian, viii. 100. Faithful to the church, 409. Christian, first epoch of, 411. Roman, 412. Greek and Latin, 414. Byzantine, 418. Church, influenced by ritual, 422. Christian, progressive, 424. Lombard or Romanesque, 432. Norman, 438. Gothic, 437. Affected by climate, 446. Mediæval, 436.
- Ardois*, Marquis of Ivrea, iii. 222.
- Ariald*, iii. 315. His strife with Guido, 345, 346. His flight and death, 347.
- Arian* clergy (Goths), their moderation, i. 414. Were probably Teutonic, 547.
- Arianism* of Teutonic converts, i. 371, 377. Its propagators unknown, 372. Of Goths, 418. Put an end to in Spain, ii. 70. In Gaul, 70.
- Aristotelian* philosophy, viii. 245.
- Aristotle*, Arabic adoption of, viii. 243. Dialectics of, 245. Condemned at Paris, 248. Versions of, from Arabic, 249. Becomes known in original, 250.
- Arles*, Council of, i. 102. Archbishopric of, 271.
- Arles*, Cardinal of, viii. 54. At Diet of Frankfort, 94.
- Arnaud*, William, Inquisitor at Toulouse, murdered, vi. 33.
- Arnold* of Brescia, iv. 180, 229. A disciple of Abélard, 230. His Republicanism, 231, 232. Preaches in Brescia, 233. Condemned by Lateran Council, flies to Zurich, 233. Protected by Guido di Castello, 237. Persecuted by St. Bernard, 238. Revered by Waldenses, 239. In Rome, 239. Decline of his influence, 262. Banished, 266. Seized and executed, 271. Revival of his opinions, v. 137.
- Arnold*, Abbot, Papal Legate in Languedoc, v. 192. Persecutes Count Raymond, 197. Made Archbishop of Narbonne, 205. Charges against, 206. At Lateran Council, 212.
- Arnulf* invades Italy — sacks Bergamo, iii. 106, 107. His second invasion — enters Rome — crowned Emperor, 109. His sudden illness and retreat, 109.
- Arnulf*, Archbishop of Rheims, iii. 205. His treachery to Hugh Capet, 206. Is betrayed and imprisoned, 208. His deposition, 209.
- Arnulf*, Bishop of Orleans, his speech against corruption of papacy, iii. 210.
- Arragon*, affairs of, v. 68. Made feudatory to Pope, 67. The nobles and people remonstrate, 69.

AVIGNON.

- Arragon*, House of, representatives of Manfred, vi. 149. Franciscan prophecies about, vii. 44.
- Arsenius*, Papal Legate in France, iii. 51. Reinstates Queen Theutberga, 53. His flight and death, 67.
- Art*, devotional, ii. 298. Objects of, 349. Conventional, viii. 468. Development of, 474. Cultivated by Mendicant orders, 479. German — Flemish, 484.
- Artaradus* usurps throne of Constantinople, ii. 324. Is defeated and blinded, 325.
- Arthur*, King, legends of, viii. 357.
- Arthur*, Prince, death of, v. 17.
- Arundel*, Archbishop of Canterbury, vii. 408. Accuses Lord Cobham, 417.
- Aschpaller*, Peter, Archbishop of Mentz, vi. 472, 511; vii. 69.
- Asiatic* Christianity, feebleness of, ii. 109.
- Assisi*, birthplace of St. Francis, v. 254. Splendor of church at, viii. 479, 480.
- Astolph*, Lombard king, seizes Ravenna, ii. 417. Threatens Rome, 418. Defeated by Franks — obtains peace — besieges Rome, 422. Yields to Pepin, 426. His death, 427.
- Asylum*, in Barbaric law, i. 531, 539.
- Atha'ric*, son of Theodoric, raised to throne of Italy — his death, i. 456. Laws of on church matters, 515.
- Athanasian* creed, i. 100.
- Athanasius*, i. 97. His ascendancy at Rome, 100. Supported by Pope Liberius, 103.
- Athanasius*, Bishop-Duke of Naples, iii. 88. Unites with the Saracens, 90. Excommunicated by John VIII., his intrigues, 96.
- Attalus* made Emperor by Alaric, i. 153. Deposed by him, 153.
- Attila*, his unbounded power, i. 300. His invasion of Italy, 301. Threatens Rome, 301. Induced to retire by Leo I., 301. Probable causes of this, 302.
- Averrhoes*, viii. 245, 252.
- Augustine*, St., his "City of God," i. 161. Opposes Pelagius, 165. The leader of Latin theology, 170. Opinions on infant baptism, 171. Persecutes Pelagians, 183, 187.
- Augustine*, his mission to Britain, ii. 66, 178. His meeting with Ethelbert, 178. Bishop of Canterbury, 180. His dispute with British clergy, 183. His establishment at Canterbury, 184.
- Augustinianism* coincides with sacerdotal system, i. 172. On transmission of original sin, 174. Similar to Manichæism, 175. Exalts celibacy, 176.
- Augustus*, title of Rheni, vii. 169.
- Aricenna*, viii. 245, 252.
- Avignon*, Pope Clement V. at, vi. 495. Consistory at, 490. Its political situa-

AVITUS.

tion, vii. 16. Becomes seat of pope-
dom, 20. Court of, under Clement VI.,
136. Immorality at, 138. Sold to
Pope, 148. Consistory of, 198. Con-
clave at, its statutes, 200. Papal resi-
dence at concluded, 226. Siege of,
235.
Aussitz, battle of, vii. 547.
Autharis, king of Lombards, his wars
with the Franks, ii. 75. Overruns
Italy, 76. His death, 76.
Autocracy, Papal, growth of, iv. 460.
Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, adheres to Clo-
vis, i. 382. His conference with Gunde-
bald, 383.
Azeredo, Bishop of Osma, v. 241.

B.

Babylon, name applied to Rome, vii. 85,
54.
" *Babylonish captivity* " ended, vii. 226.
Bacon, Lord, viii. 296.
Bacon, Roger, viii. 288. At Oxford,
299. His studies, 290. Persecuted by
Nicolas IV., 291. Dedicates work to
Clement IV., 292. His astrology, 294.
His science and discoveries, 295.
Badbee, John, burned, vii. 415.
Baldwin, Count of Flanders, joins the
crusade, v. 86. At Zara, 99. Emper-
or of Constantinople, 103. His address
to Pope, 112. His captivity, 120.
Ball, John, vii. 887.
Balthasar Coesa. See John XXIII.
Bamberg, Diet at, iv. 516. Its answer to
Pope Innocent III., 517.
Bankers, Italian, vi. 258.
Bannerets, at Rome, vii. 277.
Baptism, infant, question of, v. 142. Com-
pulsory, viii. 885.
Baptisteries, viii. 434.
Barbaric codes, affected by Christianity,
i. 481. Were national, 514. Rights of
persons under, 527. On slavery, 527.
On slaves' marriages, 528. On the
slaying of slaves, 530. On runaway
slaves, 531. On adultery and divorce,
533. On property—on church prop-
erty, 535. Against heresy—against
witchcraft, 542.
Barbarossa, Frederick. See Frederick
Barbarossa.
Barbiano, Alberic, vii. 249. Besieges No-
cera, 256. Enters papal service, 279.
Baroli, assembly of, v. 347.
Barons, English, commence resistance to
King John, v. 43. Demand charter of
Henry I., 47. Extort Magna Charta,
50. Pope Innocent's letter to, 52.
Excommunicated, 53.
Barons, Roman, submit to Rienzi, vii. 165.
Are seized and pardoned, 177, 178.

BECKET.

Barsumas the monk, at Synod of Ephe-
sus, i. 287. At Council of Chalcedon,
294. His factious conduct in exile, 318.
Bartholomew of Carcassonne, v. 225.
Basil the Macedonian, murders Michael
III., and becomes Emperor, iii. 34.
Calls Council at Constantinople, and
deposes Bishop Photius, 34. Restores
him, and dies, 36, 37.
Basilicas, viii. 415, 421.
Basiliscus usurps Empire—favors Euty-
chianism—resistance to, i. 821. His
fall, 823.
Basle, Council of, summoned by Martin
V., vii. 535. Ambassadors from, 556.
Right of voting at, 557. Inhibited by
Eugenius IV., 559. Acknowledged by
Pope, 561. Asserts supremacy, 566.
Eminent deputies at, 566. Bohemians
at, 567. Proposes reform of clergy, 569.
Dispute in, viii. 16. Summons Pope
and Cardinals, 18. Declares suspen-
sion of Pope, 18. Equips a fleet, 22.
Indifference to, 36. Jealousy of Pope,
52. Quarrels in, 53. Declares deposi-
tion of Pope, 55. Appoints a Conclave,
58. Elects Felix V., 58. Dissolved,
102.
Bathildis, Queen, ii. 393.
Beatific vision, question of, vii. 116.
Beatrice, married to Otho IV., iv. 534.
Her death, 534.
Beaufort, Cardinal, at Constance, vii. 532.
Leads crusade against Hussites, 533,
548. His death, 534.
Bec, Abbey of, its origin, iv. 192. Its
great churchmen, 800.
Becket, his character, iv. 808. Legend
of his parentage, 809. His birth and
education, 811, 812. At Rome, 814.
Appointed Chancellor, 816. His pow-
er, 817. Ambassador to Paris, his
splendor, 818. Elected Archbishop,
823. His change of manner, 825.
Resigns chancellorship, 826. Attends
Council of Tours, 827. Quarrels with
Henry II., 828, 830, 831. Jealousy of,
834. At Parliament of Westminster,
834. Swears to Constitutions of Clar-
endon, 837. Refuses to seal them,
839. Absolved from oath by Pope,
840. Attempts to fly from kingdom,
841. Breaks his oath, 842. Cited be-
fore Council of Northampton and fined,
843. Condemned for perjury, 849. His
flight, 852. Adventures, 853. Recep-
tion of in France, 858. At Pontigny,
861. Cites the King, 865. Invested
with legatine power, 867. At Vezelay,
868. Excommunicates Henry's adher-
ents, 869. At Sens, 871. Controversy
with English clergy, 872. His letter to
Pope, 873. His quarrel with Papal leg-
ates, 879, 880. His indignation, 881.

PAGE.

BERNARD.

Letter to the Cardinals, 388. At Montmirail, 384. His attempted treaty with Henry II., 391. Places England under interdict, 393. King's proclamation against, 397. His letter to his suffragans, 398. Anger against the Pope, 399. Reconciliation with King, 402. Meets Henry at Tours, 405. Resistance to his restoration, 406. Lands at Sandwich, 408. Refuses absolution to Bishops, 409. Annoyed by his enemies, 410. Angry interview with the four knights, 413. Murdered, 416. Miracles, 417. Saint and martyr—King Henry's penance at tomb of, 420. Was martyr for clerical immunity, 421. Verdict of posterity upon, 423.

Bede, ii. 224. His learning and theology, 225. His science, 228.

Belisarius, conquers Africa, i. 455. Enters Rome, 461.

Benedict I., Pope, i. 476.

Benedict II., Pope, ii. 287.

Benedict III., Pope, iii. 20.

Benedict IV., Pope, iii. 154.

Benedict V., Pope, iii. 184. Deposed by Otho I., banished, and dies at Hamburg, 185.

Benedict VI., Pope, murdered by Bonifazio, iii. 188.

Benedict VII., Pope, iii. 188.

Benedict VIII., Pope, iii. 224. Crowns Henry II., 225. His victories over Saracens, 228.

Benedict IX., Pope, a boy, his vices, iii. 229. Sells the Papacy, 230. Reclaims it, 232. Deposed by Henry III., 233. His return and flight, 238.

Benedict X., Pope, elected by Roman party, iii. 294. His flight, 297. Degradation and death, 297.

Benedict XI., his prudence, vi. 360. Absolves Philip the Fair, 361. Restores the Colonnas, 362. His death, 367. Alleged to have been poisoned, 367.

Benedict XII., his election and first measures, vii. 121. Builds palace at Avignon, 123. Negotiates with Louis of Bavaria, 123, 124. His answer to Philip of Valois, 123. His reforms and character, 123.

Benedict XIII., vii. 274. Called on to renounce Papacy, 281. His counter-project, 281. His obstinate refusal, 284. Besieged in his palace, 285. His imprisonment and escape, 288. His embassy to Boniface IX., 290. Letter to Gregory XII., 297. In Italy, 301. Excommunicates French King, 304. His flight, 306. In Spain, 307. His Council at Perpignan, 310. Declared deposed at Pisa, 317. His deputies at Constance, 457. His firmness, 510. His death, 511.

Benedict Biscop, companion of Wilfrid, ii. 202. Builds monastery at Wearmouth—imports paintings and MSS., 210, 211.

Benedict, Cardinal, Legate to Constantinople, v. 119, 120. His settlement of Latin Church, 121.

Benedict, St., of Nursia, ii. 23. His age favorable to monasticism, 23. His birth and parentage, 24. Miraculous accounts of his youth, 25. His temptations, 26. His fame—his monasteries at Subiaco, 27. Plotted against by Florentius, 28. Removes to Monte Casino—his rule, 29, 30. Enjoins labor, 30. His visions, 33. His interview with Totila, 33. His death, 34.

Benedictine convents, their rapid spread in Italy, ii. 35. In France, 36. In England, 37.

Benedictines in England, iii. 335.

Benefices, sale of, vii. 270.

Benvenuto, admits Leo IX., iii. 277. Battle of, vi. 95. Sack of, 97.

Benzo, iii. 323. His influence at Rome and invectives against Hildebrand, 324, 325.

Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, iii. 173. King of Italy, 175, 178. Taken prisoner by Otho I., 188.

Berengar, Duke of Friuli, iii. 103. Defeated by Guido, 104. His war with Louis of Provence, 158. Crowned Emperor at Rome, 161. Murdered, 164.

Berengar of Tours a pupil of Erigena, iii. 261. His opinions on the Real Presence, 262. At council of Vercelli, 265. Condemned by council of Paris—submits, 267. His recantation—revokes it, 300. Renews question of Transubstantiation, 474. Acquitted by Gregory VII., 476.

Berengaria, Queen of Leon, v. 63.

Berenger de Talon, vii. 58.

Bernabo Visconti, his crimes, vii. 212.

Bernard, St., iv. 155. His youth, 162. At Cîteaux, 164. Founds Clairvaux, 165. His miracles, 167. Embraces cause of Innocent II., 168-175. Jealous of Abélard, 208. Opposes him at Sens, 213. His letter to Innocent II., 217. Persecutes Arnold of Brescia, 223. His power over Eugenius III., 244. Interferes in archbishopric of York, 247. Preaches the Crusade, 250. Persuades Louis VII. and Emperor Conrad to take the Cross, 251, 252. Protects Jews, 253. His Crusade fails, 254. His death, 256. Silences heresies in the south of France, v. 146. His conquest transitory, 147, 148. His address to Templars, vi. 355. Hymns ascribed to, viii. 310.

Bernard, Count de Foix, v. 302.

Bernard de Goth. See Clement V.

BERNHARD.

- Bernhard*, grandson of Charlemagne, ii. 514. King in Italy, 518. His unsuccessful rebellion, 524; and death, 525.
- Bernhard*, Duke of Septimania, ii. 532. His flight, 534; and return, 537.
- Bertha*, a Frankish princess, ii. 178. Queen of Ethelbert, 178.
- Bertha*, wife of Adalbert of Tuscany, iii. 158. Her ambitious intrigues, 158.
- Berthold*, Regent of Naples, v. 516. His weakness, 517; and treachery, 518.
- Berthold* of Winterthur, his preaching, viii. 395.
- Besançon*, diet at, iv. 275.
- Bessarion* of Nicea, viii. 39, 42. Cardinal, 123.
- Beziers*, siege of, v. 187.
- Beziers*, Viscount of, his defence of Carcassonne, v. 188. Dies in prison, 190.
- Bianca Lancia*, mistress of Frederick II., v. 331.
- Bible*, Hebrew, viii. 492. Interpretation of, 504. Versions of:—Vulgate, i. 117. Gothic, 376. Moravian, iii. 124. Provençal, v. 154. Wycliffe's, vii. 384; viii. 384, 493. New, 125. German, 367.
- Biblical Antisacerdotalists*, v. 150. Criticism, viii. 492.
- Biordo*, chief of Condottieri, vii. 276. Assassinated, 276.
- Birinus*, first Bishop of Dorchester, ii. 192.
- Bishops*, under Teutons, become warlike, i. 397. Their mixed character, 398. Grow into a separate order, 399. Under Justinian's code, 497. Ordered to inspect prisons—to suppress gaming, 512. How elected, 521. Their municipal authority, 525. Their power, 548. Appointed by Emperor, ii. 495.
- Bishops*, English, in civil war of Stephen and Matilda, iv. 306. Their warlike character, 306. Their advice to Becket, 345, 346. Their controversy with Becket, 372. Address the Pope, 373. Their hesitation, 389. Their fear of Interdict, 397. Excommunicated, 411. Satires on, viii. 329.
- Bishoprics* of Anglo-Saxons, ii. 233, 234.
- Bishoprics*, English, law of election to, iv. 337.
- Bianche* of Castile, Regent of France, vi. 16. Her death, 31.
- Blasius* raises the Easter question at Rome—deposed by Pope Victor, i. 64.
- Bobbio*, monastery of, ii. 246.
- Boccaccio*, viii. 342. His "Decamerone," 347.
- Boethius*, a Roman, minister of Theodoric, i. 437. His trial and imprisonment, 439. Composes the "Consolation of Philosophy," 443. His cruel death, 444.

BONIFACE.

- Bogoris*, King of Bulgaria, his conversion, iii. 116. Quells insurrection, 117. Applies to Pope Nicolas I., 119.
- Bohemia*, conversion of, iii. 127. Policy of Pope Innocent III. towards, v. 70. Connection of with England, vii. 405, 438. Wycliffism in, 425. Isolation of, 436. Indignation in at death of Huss, 499. Hussite war in, 542. Rises against Sigismund, 545.
- Bohemians*, their memorial to Council of Constance, vii. 485. At Basle, 567. Dissensions among, 568. Reverses, 568.
- Bologna*, John XXIII. Legate in, viii. 331. Conclave at, 332.
- Bonaventura*, St., General of Franciscans, vi. 73. His alleged refusal of papacy, 123. Dies, 130. One of the great Schoolmen, viii. 254. Mysticism of, 272-276. His Hymn of the Cross, 309.
- Boniface I.*, Pope, his disputed election, i. 193. His character, 199.
- Boniface II.*, contest at his election, i. 457. Attempts to nominate his successor, 457.
- Boniface III.*, assumes title of "Universal Bishop," ii. 284.
- Boniface IV.*, ii. 266.
- Boniface V.*, ii. 286.
- Boniface VIII.* (Benedetto Gaetani), rebukes Charles the Lame, vi. 183. His ascendancy at Naples, 191. His election, 205. Imprisons Celestine V., 208. His views of Papal authority, 210. His experiences as Legate, 212. His advances to Frederick of Arragon, 216. Summons Charles of Valois to Italy, 220. His jealousy of the Colonnas, 222. Excommunicates the Colonnas, 226. His measures in Italy, 230. Excommunicates Albert of Austria, 236. Forbids wars of Edward I., 248. Issues bull "Clericis Laicos," 259. Second bull against Philip the Fair, 268-270. Philip's reply to, 271. Arbitrator between France and England, 277. Forbids Edward's Scotch wars, 280. Institutes Jubilee, 284. At the height of his power, 287. His enemies, 288. Estranges Franciscans, 290. Persecutes Fraticelli, 292. Abandons Scots, 299. His quarrel with Philip of France, 298. Rumors of his pride, 304. Sends Legate to France, 306. Receives embassy from King Philip, 310. His bulls against Philip, 311, 313, 315. Address of French clergy to, 321. His reply, 323. His speech before Consistory, 325. Issues bull "Unam Sanctam," 328. Acknowledges Albert of Austria Emperor, 330. Acknowledges Frederick of Sicily, 331. Offers terms to Philip, 332. Excommunicates Philip,

CRADWALLA.

East, 488. Alleged conspiracies of at Rome, 484.
Cradwalla, ii. 189. His conquest of Sussex, 217. His conversion, 218. Goes to Rome for absolution — dies, 218.
Cecco d'Ascoli, Astrologer, burned, vii. 97.
"Celestial Hierarchy," viii. 191. Belief in, 192. Greek origin of, 195.
Celestine I., Pope, i. 200. Pronounces against Nestorius, 221. Sends envoys to Constantinople, 223. Excommunicates Nestorius, 224. His letters to the Council of Ephesus, 238.
Celestius, a follower of Pelagius, i. 164. Appeals to Pope Zosimus, 180. Is declared orthodox, 181. Subsequently condemned, 184.
Celibacy, honor of, ii. 98.
Celibacy of clergy, i. 120; v. 232. Resistance to, i. 121. Prevents degeneracy of church, iii. 374. Consequences of viii. 183. Its effect on morals, 168.
Celidonius — his appeal to Rome, i. 273.
Cencius seizes Pope Gregory VII., iii. 425. His flight, 427.
Cencius, Consul of Rome, iii. 502.
Cery, crusade of, v. 86.
Cesena, Michael di, general of Franciscans, his argument, vii. 60. At Avignon, 61. Joins Louis of Bavaria, 109.
Cesena, massacre of, vii. 224, 284.
Chadijah, wife of Mohammed, ii. 122. His first convert, 125.
Chalcedon, Synod of, i. 242.
Chalcedon, Council of, reverses sentence of Synod of Ephesus, i. 292. Condemns Dioscorus, 298. Its decrees confirmed by Emperor Marcian, 296. Equalizes Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, 296.
Champeaux, William of, iv. 198.
Chancery, Papal, vii. 515.
Chapters, "The Three," i. 465. Disputes about, 467. Condemned by Vigilius, 468.
Charity of clergy, viii. 166.
Charlemagne marries Hermingard, ii. 488. Divorces her — marries Hildegard, 442. Sole King, 443. Besieges Pavia, 443. At Rome — his Donation to Pope Hadrian I., 447. Destroys the Lombard kingdom, 448. His second visit to Rome, 451. Suppresses rebellions, 452. Crowned by Pope — consequences of this act, 458. His league with the Pope, 461. Extent of his empire, 466. His power personal, 468. His character, 471. His wives, 471. His Saxon wars, 472. Destroys the Irmin-Saule, 477. His successes, 480. Founds bishoprics, 481. His ecclesiastical legislation, 488, 491. Supremacy over church, 484. Grants to the

CHARLES IV.

church, 488. His Institutes, 491. Rules for monasteries, 492. For church government, 494. For election of bishops, 495; and of parochial clergy, 496. Holds Council of Frankfort, 498. His measures strengthen Papacy, 507. Literature of, 508. His death, 513. His defences against Northmen neglected after his death, iii. 180. Legends of, vii. 357. Conversions by, 365.
Charles Martel, protects St. Boniface, ii. 249. His victory at Tours, 335. Hated by the Frankish clergy, 391, 491. His violation of Church property, 400. His death, 402.
Charles the Bald, his birth, ii. 532. Seizes kingdom of Lorraine, iii. 70. Combines with his brother Louis, 73. His sons, 78. Usurps empire — crowned by Pope John VIII., 82. His defeat by Louis of Saxony, and death, 83, 84.
Charles the Fat crowned Emperor, iii. 97. His death, 102.
Charles of Lorraine, iii. 206.
Charles of Anjou, his treaty with Urban IV., vi. 85. Senator of Rome, 90. At Rome, 93. His victory at Benevento, 95. His tyranny, 98. Letter of Clement IV. to, 106. Defeats and puts to death Conradin, 114. His barbarity, 118. His designs on Constantinople, 141. Procures election of Martin IV., 143. His ambition, 145. His preparations against Peter of Arragon, 154. His conduct during Sicilian insurrection, 158. Lays siege to Messina, 160. Evacuates Sicily, 164. At Bordeaux, 168. His reverses and death, 170.
Charles II. of Naples (the Lame), takes prisoner, vi. 170. Surrenders claim to Sicily, 173. His liberation, 174. Show of deference to Celestine V., 187. Gets Pope into his power, 190. His treaty with James of Arragon, 215. His enmity to Templars, 469.
Charles III. of Naples, vii. 250. Conducts Urban VI. to Naples, 253. Gonfalonier of the Church, 254. Quarrels with Pope, 255. Besieges Nocera, 259. Murdered, 261.
Charles of Valois, his fruitless attempt upon Arragon, vi. 169. Surrenders his claim, 217. Invades Sicily, 220. His victories in Flanders, 276. His alliance damages Pope, 294. Seeks the empire, 418.
Charles the Fair, his divorce and marriage, vii. 80. His attempt on empire, 83.
Charles IV. (of Moravia), proclaimed King of Romans, vii. 145. His flight at Crecy, 147. Proposals of Rienz to, 187. His answer, 189. Goes to Italy,

CHARLES VI.

202. Issues the Golden Bull, 203. Visits Avignon, 215. At Rome, 217. King of Bohemia, 437.
Charles VI. of France. attempts to end schism, vii, 280. Acknowledges Benedict XIII., 290. Proclaims neutrality between Popes, 306.
Chastity, laws for protection of, v. 390.
Chaucer, viii. 372. An *English* poet. 385. His travels, reading, 385, 386; and poetry, 387. Creator of native poetry, 387. His pictures of ecclesiastics, 388. Imprisonment of, 391.
Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury, instigates Henry V. to war, vii. 580. Letter of Martin V. to, 581.
Chilperic deposed, ii. 410.
Chivalry, iv. 35. Its origin in the Crusades, 61. Of the Saracens, 60. Adopts worship of Virgin, viii. 206.
Chlum, *De*, Bohemian noble, protects Huss, vii. 444, 447. Supports him at Constance, 488, 489.
Christ, sculptured representations of in churches, viii. 448. Traditional representations of, 468, 469. Represented as judge, 470.
Christendom, three systems of law in, i. 483. State of at accession of Innocent III., iv. 472. Seeming peace of under Innocent III., v. 133. Public opinion in, 432. Advance of in the North, vi. 539. Contest in, vii. 104. Indignant at Papal schism, 304.
Christian morals, controversy on, i. 78. Jurisprudence, 479, 481. It is mixed with secular, 482. Europe, unity of, viii. 163. Literature, 233. Terms, Teutonic, 331. Latin terms, 339.
Christian mythology. See *Legends*.
Christianity, in its origin Greek, i. 19. Its progressive development, 30. Teutonic, 23. In Rome; its growth, 47. Obscurity of, 49. Its early influence on morals, 50. Its apparent failure to produce good, 353. Its innate goodness and power, 354. Becomes warlike, 365. Barbarized by Teutonic conquests, 397. Its effect on Roman law, 480. Its special jurisprudence, 481. Introduces new crimes, 512, 541. Its dependence on Papacy, ii. 42. Asiatic. its decline, 109. In Arabia, imperfect, 137. Eastern, its want of energy, 154. Feeble resistance to Mohammedism, 156. Humiliation of, 160. Effect of Mohammedan conquests on, 169. The only bond of union in Europe, 173. Its extension in the West, 174. In Britain, 175. Unites the Anglo-Saxons, 233. In Sweden, iii. 139. Allied to military spirit, iv. 35. Popular articles of, viii. 136. Adapted to humanity, 497.

CLARENDON.

Christopher, Pope, iii. 155.
Chronicles, viii. 331.
Chronology of first four centuries, i. 82-89. Fifth century, 125. Sixth century, 310, 311. Seventh and eighth centuries, ii. 104-108. From A. D. 800 to 1050, 464, 465. Eleventh century, iii. 359. Twelfth century, iv. 62, 63. Of Innocent III., 459. Thirteenth century, v. 282, 283. Fourteenth century, 369. Fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, vii. 227.
Chrysaphius, the Eunuch, minister of Theodosius II., his intrigues, i. 284.
Chrysostom, translated from Antioch to Constantinople, i. 140. Incurs enmity of Arcadius—appeals to Pope and Western Bishops, 141. Supported by Innocent I. and Emperor Honorius, 141, 142.
Church, Royal supremacy over, i. 482. Growing power of after Charlemagne, ii. 533. Jealous of empire in Papal elections, iii. 240. Its power and wealth lead to simony, 379. Enriched by crusades, iv. 45. Its jealousy of law, v. 395. The, definition of, vii. 90. Great field for ambition, 356.
Church-building, viii. 425, 426. Incentives for, 427. Good effects of, 431.
Church property, secured by Constantine, i. 508. By other Emperors, 509. Rapid growth and inviolability of, 509-511. Alarming increase of, in France, 533. Liable to taxation, 537. Taxed under Becket's chancellorship, iv. 320. Various kinds of, viii. 141. Extent of, 144.
Church services, settled by Gregory the Great, ii. 55. Effect of on languages, viii. 355.
Churches, sanctity of, ii. 99. Burial in, ii. 99. In Latin Christendom, viii. 410. In Rome, 416. In Constantinople, 418. At Ravenna, 420. Of Venice and Lombardy, 421. For the priests, 428. Splendor of, 430. The people's, 431. Medieval, influence of, 450.
Cimabue, viii. 476.
Circus, contests of, revived by Justinian, i. 451.
Cisalpine architecture, viii. 411.
Cistercian order, iv. 161. Monks, legates in South of France, v. 167.
Citeaux, monks of, iv. 162.
Cities under Frederick II., v. 337.
Clairvaux, Abbey of, founded by St. Bernard, iv. 165. Innocent II. visits, 170.
Clara founds Poor Sisterhood at Assisi, v. 280.
Clarendon, Council of, iv. 336. Constitutions of, 337. Condemned by Alexander III., 359.

CLAUDIAN.

- Claudian*, his poems on Stilicho — his silence about Christianity, i. 144.
- Claudius* of Turin, ii. 550.
- Clement* II., Pope, iii. 287. Crowns Henry III. Emperor — attempts to reform Church, 287. Dies, 288.
- Clement* III. reconciled to Romans, iv. 446.
- Clement* IV., legate to England, vi. 87. Holds court at Boulogne, 89. Chosen Pope, 91. Supports Charles of Anjou, 92. Commands crusade against English Barons, 100. His legate in England, 102. His treatment of James of Arragon, 107. Declaration against Conradin — advice to Charles of Anjou, 108. Accused of counselling death of Conradin, 116. Dies, 117. Countenances Roger Bacon, viii. 292.
- Clement* V. (Bernard de Goth), vi. 378. His secret compact with Philip the Fair, 374. Elected Pope, 375. Coronation at Lyons, 375. His measures in French interest, 376, 381. Absolves Edward I. from oaths, 380. Excommunicates Robert Bruce, 381. His embarrassment, 381. Consents to call Council of Vienne, 382. Absolves William of Nogaret, 383. Summons Grandmasters of Military orders, 390. His indignation at the arrest of Templars, 409. His Bull to Edward II., 410. His alarm at power of the Valois, 413. His dissimulation, 414. His vacillation in the matter of the Templars, 417, 420. Appoints commission, 422. His involved position and weakness, 474. At Avignon — fails to retard proceedings against Boniface VIII., 484. His difficulties, 486. Correspondence with Philip, 487. Claims sole jurisdiction in matter of Boniface VIII., 488. Opens consistory at Avignon, 490. Examines witnesses, 493. Is permitted to pronounce judgment, 500. His Bull, 501; and judgment, 502. Holds Council of Vienne, 504. Lays Venice under interdict, 513. His league with Henry of Luxemburg, 514. His death — his wealth and nepotism, 520. Decline of Papacy in him, 531. Review of his Popedom and policy, 531. Persecution of heretics under, vii. 50. Dispute about his wealth, 51.
- Clement* VI., his first acts, vii. 135. His splendid court, 136. Nepotism of, 138. Excommunicates Louis of Bavaria, 139, 144. Supports Charles of Moravia, 145. His declaration against Rienzi, 181. Speech in defence of Mendicants — his death, 198.
- Clement* VII. (Robert of Geneva) commands mercenaries in Italy, vii. 222. Sacks Faenza and Cesena, 224. At con-

CLERGY.

- clave at Rome, 231. Elected Antipope, 243. His acts — flies from Naples, 243. Crowns Louis of Anjou King of Naples, 252. At Avignon, 263. Deputation to, from University of Paris, 273. His death, 273.
- Clementina*, The, origin of, i. 61. Judaism of, 62. Hatred to St. Paul betrayed therein, 62.
- Clergy* encourage superstition, i. 400. Laws of Justinian for, 496. In the west were Latin, 546. Delinquencies of, 551. Sanctity of, miraculously asserted, ii. 98. Low-born, encouraged by Louis the Pious, 538. Inferior, insecurity of, iii. 62. Plundered by Northmen, 72. Hereditary, danger of, 876. Their luxury, iv. 228. Their relations with people, v. 231. Taxation of, 319; vi. 258. Their hatred of Mendicants, vii. 322. Administrative influence of, viii. 126. Their spiritual power, 126. Their wealth, 144. Unity, 157. Their common language, 160. Ubiquity, 161. Unite Europe, 162. Effects of on social rank, 163. Of low birth, 165. Charity of — assert equality of mankind, 166, 167. Morals of, 168. Buildings of, 425.
- Clergy*, celibacy of, v. 232; viii. 168.
- Clergy*, marriage of, allowed in the Greek church, i. 79; and in the early Roman, 79. Maintained at Milan, iii. 313. Condemned by Stephen IX., 313. Prevalence of, 314–351. Continued strife about, 341–351. Urged upon Council of Basle, vii. 562.
- Clergy*, married, in Italy, iii. 278. In Germany, 379. In France, 380. In England, 382; vi. 106. Harsh decrees of Gregory VII. against, iii. 419. Their resistance in France, 422.
- Clergy*, English, their benefits to civilisation, ii. 228. Remonstrate against Papal exactions, v. 486. Subordinate to King's courts, vi. 239. Approve measures of Edward I., 244. Taxation of, 249. Refuse subsidy, 261. Are outlawed, 261. They yield, 263. Guardians of national liberties, 264. Subject to civil laws, vii. 246. Alien, petition against, vii. 374. Promote French wars, 520. Piers Ploughman on, vii. 477. Of Chaucer, 389.
- Clergy*, French, obey Papal Interdict, iv. 546. Contempt of in Provence, 164. In crusade against heretics, 180, 205. At Lateran Council, 212. Taxation of, vi. 258. Their submission to Philip the Fair, 274.
- Clergy*, German, how elected under Charlemagne, ii. 496. Their revenues, 496.
- Clergy*, Roman, impress Teutons with respect, i. 386. Their self-devotion and

CLERGY.

patience, 869. Their influence in wars of Franks, 888. Look upon Franks as deliverers, 887. Continue distinct, 888. Indulge vices of Teutonic princes, 895. Subject to common law among Teutons, 519, 522. Admitted to national councils, 524. Their position as mediators, 525.

Clergy, in Sicily, laws of Frederick II. about, v. 886.

Clergy, immunities of. *See* Immunities.

Clerical crimes, iv. 830. Jurisdiction separate, established by William the Conqueror, 839.

Clermont, Council of, iv. 28. Determines on Crusade, 31.

Climate, as affecting architecture, viii. 448.

Cloistral painters, viii. 481, 482.

Clotilda, Queen of Clovis, i. 379. Is the means of Clovis's conversion, 880.

Clovis, a pagan Frankish chief, i. 378. Marries Clotilda, 379. His conversion, 880. The only orthodox sovereign, 881. His religious wars against Burgundians, 882. Against Visigoths, 884. His ferocity and perfidy, 885.

Clogny, abbey of, its degeneracy, iv. 160.

Cobham, Lord, vii. 417. His trial, 420. *Recapes*, 421. His arrest and execution, 424.

Code of Justinian. *See* Justinian.

Codes previous to Justinian, i. 484.

Celestine II. (Guido di Castello), a friend of Abélard, iv. 219. Protects Arnold of Brescia, 237. Elected Pope, 241. His death, 242.

Celestine III., crowns Emperor Henry VI., iv. 448. Queen Eleanor's letters to, 451. Excommunicates Emperor, 458. Removes excommunication after Henry's death, 458.

Celestine IV., his election and death, v. 458.

Celestine V. (Peter Morrone), his monasticism, vi. 183; and visions, 184. Receives announcement of his election, 186. His reluctance, 186. Inauguration, 188. At Naples, 190. His hermit followers, 187, 197. Becomes a tool of Charles the Lame, 191. Abdicates, 194. Legality of the act doubted, 198. Seized and imprisoned — dies, 208. His canonization, 209.

Celestinians, vi. 210. Unite with Fratelli, 291.

Coin, debasement of, vi. 379.

Colleges, foundation of, viii. 179, 180.

Cologne, tumults in, iv. 411. Burning of heretics at, v. 161.

Colonna, Cardinal, v. 451.

Colonna, James, vii. 102.

Colonna, Otto. *See* Martin V.

CONRAD.

Colonna, Sciarra, in Italy, vi. 851. His attack on Boniface VIII., 852. Violent conduct, 854. Excepted from Papal pardon, 883. Captain of Roman people, vii. 98. His flight, 107. Death, 110.

Colonna, Stephen, his submission to Rienzi, vii. 164.

Columnas, vi. 173. Their ascendancy, 178. Boniface VIII. jealous of, 222. Their power, 228. Papal Bull against, 224. Their reply, 225. Excommunicated, 226. Their castles taken, 228. Their flight, 230. Excluded from Jubilee, 286. Received by King of France, 805. Their calumnies against Boniface VII., 844. Restored by Benedict XI., 862. Under Roman republic, 176. Defeated by Rienzi, 179.

Columban, St., ii. 237. His birth, 238. His travels, 238. Founda monastery at Luxeuil, and abbey of Fontaines — his dispute with Gaulish Bishops, 239. Rebukes King Thierry and Queen Brunehaut, 240, 241. Is banished, 243. Returns to France, 244. His strife with pagans in Switzerland — removes to Bregenz, 245. Thence to Bobbio, 246.

Comedies, religious, viii. 817.

Commendams, vii. 519-521.

Commissioners, Papal, at Montmirail, iv. 834.

Commissioners in the matter of the Templars, vi. 419. Their sittings at Paris, 424. Call on Templars to appoint proctors, 436. Continue examinations, 447. Adjourn, 448.

Commodus, reign of, i. 65. Toleration of Christianity — death, 67.

Commons, English, petition against hierarchy, vii. 865. Petition Henry IV., viii. 149.

Commons of France, vi. 415.

Conception, Immaculate, viii. 208.

Conceptualism of Abélard, iv. 223.

Concordat of Worms, iv. 144.

Concordats of Martin V. not accepted by nations, vii. 520.

Concubinage legalized, i. 508. Of clergy, iii. 244.

Confession, auricular, v. 231; viii. 137.

Conon, Pope, ii. 287.

Conon, Cardinal of Præneste, iv. 120.

Conrad the Salic, King of Italy, his coronation at Milan, iii. 806, 807. Crowned at Rome as Emperor, 227.

Conrad III., Emperor, invited by Roman insurgents, iv. 240. Takes the cross, 252.

Conrad, son of Henry IV., his character, iii. 514. His league with Papal faction — accuses his father, 515. Is crowned King of Italy, 516. Marries a Norman princess, 520, 521. Disinherited by Henry, iv. 68. His death, 73.

CONRAD.

- Conrad*, King of Italy, alliance with Otho of Bavaria, v. 492. Defeated by Henry of Thuringia, 493. Excommunicated, 507. Obtains possession of Naples, 511. Jealous of Manfred, 514. His death, 515.
- Conrad of Lutzenberg*, iv. 481. His submission to Innocent III. 482.
- Conrad*, Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 506. His death, 509.
- Conrad*, Bishop of Wurtzburg, iv. 520. His murder, 521.
- Conradin*, infant son and successor of Conrad, v. 516; vi. 107. Supported by Romans, 111. His successes, 112. Enters Rome, 113. Defeated and put to death, 115.
- "*Consolations of Philosophy*," i. 443. Its want of Christianity, 444.
- Constance*, treaty of, iv. 439. Town of, vii. 343.
- Constance*, Council of, vii. 426. Preparations for, 427. Objects of, 433. Sermon before, 448. Number of clergy at, 450. Good order, 453. Receives deputies from antipopes, 457. Right of suffrage, 458. Proposal for a new Pope, 464. Quarrel, 466. Tumult, 469. Declares itself supreme, 471. Decrees of, 475. Cites the Pope, 478. Declares his deposition, 479. Its views of church reform, 480. Condemns Wycliffe, 484. Sends to interrogate Huss, 486. Appearance of Huss before, 487. Pronounces against administration of cup to laity, 493. Sentences Huss, 496. Its leniency to Pope John XXIII., 506. Censures doctrine of Jean Petit, 508. Contest of with Benedict XIII., 510. Divisions in, 512, 513. Endeavors for reform, 519. Conclusion of, 522. Results, 523. Unanimous against heresy, 524.
- Constant I.*, i. 101.
- Constant II.*, his jealous cruelty, ii. 274. Withdraws the Ectheals, 276. Arrests Pope Martin I., 279. Murders his brother Theodosius, 281. At Rome — plunders the churches — dies at Syracuse, 282.
- Constantia*, heiress of Sicily, marries Henry V., iv. 441. Taken by Tancred, and released, 450. Her mildness, 458. Swears allegiance to Pope, 484. Makes Innocent III. guardian of her son — dies, 484.
- Constantine*, conversion of, i. 93. Grants privileges to Roman church, 95. Porphyry font of, vii. 171. Churches of, viii. 416.
- Constantine III.*, ii. 273. His death, 273.
- Constantine the Bearded*, Emperor — summons council at Constantinople, ii. 233.

CONVERSION.

- Constantine Copronymus*, Emperor. ii. 323. Takes Constantinople, 325. Follows up the plans of Leo — calls third council of Constantinople, 327. His severity — persecutes monks, 334, 335. His cruelty to Patriarch, 336. His character and death, 338.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, his accession and minority, ii. 342. His contest with his mother Irene, 352. Seized and blinded, 354. His death, 354.
- Constantine*, Pope, his dispute with Bishop of Ravenna, ii. 290. At Constantinople, 291.
- Constantine* usurps Popedom — deposed, ii. 432. Blinded and cruelly treated, 434, 435.
- Constantine*, Bishop of Sylæum, made Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 332. Degraded by the Emperor, 336. Cruel treatment of and death, 337.
- Constantine*, founder of Paulicians, v. 158.
- Constantinople*, foundation of, i. 85. Nestorian question in, 218. Bishop of, dependent on the Court, 298. Revolutions in, mixed up with religion, 320. Tumults in, 338. Claims supremacy of Church, ii. 70. Revolutions at, on death of Heraclius, 272. Council of, condemns monothelism, 284. Tumults in, against iconoclasm, 310. Third council of, condemns image-worship, 327-331. Revolutions in, v. 92. Taken by Crusaders, 103. Partition of, 104. Sacked, 107. Effects of conquest of, 125. Taken by Turks, viii. 118. Roman art in, 417. Justinian's buildings in, 420.
- Constantius*, i. 99. His contest with Pope Liberius, 102-106.
- Contemplation of God*, viii. 240.
- Contributions to Crusades*, v. 77. Application of, 85.
- Controversy about Easter*, i. 64. Christian morals, 78. Lapsed, 82. Novatian, 83. Re-baptism of heretics, 88. Trinitarian, 98. Pelagian, 164. Semi-Pelagian, 192. Nestorian, 200, 217. Priscillianite, 277. Eutychian, 322. Of the three chapters, 466. Monothelism, ii. 266. Of iconoclasm, 293. Of marriage of clergy, iii. 313, (*see Clergy*). Of investiture, 415; iv. 98. Transubstantiation, iii. 476. Predestination, iv. 182. Infant baptism, v. 142. Absolute poverty, vii. 56. Franciscan, 58. On papal power, 63. Of beatific vision, 116. Of the cup to laity, 484. Immaculate conception, viii. 206.
- Conventional art*, viii. 473.
- Convents*. *See Monasteries*.
- Conversion of Germans within the Em-*

CONVOCAATION.

- pire, i. 355. Of Burgundians, 377. Of Franks, 378. Of Teutons, its effect, 389. Of Moravians, iii. 126. Of Hungary, 271.
- Convocation*, vii. 376. At Oxford, 393.
- Corbey*, abbey of, iii. 138.
- Cornelius*, Pope, i. 83. His confession, 85. His exile and death, 85.
- Correggio*, Gherardo. Papalist Lord of Parma. v. 495.
- Corvara*, Peter de. See Nicolas V.
- Cosmical theories*, viii. 228.
- Council*, General, Philip the Fair's appeal to, vi. 345. Proposals for, vii. 246. Assumption of power by, 318.
- Councils*, General, discreditable character of, i. 226. The causes of this, 228, 229.
- Councils*, Œcumenic, of Nicea, i. 65. Carthage, 182. Ephesus, 229. Chalcedon, 242. Second Chalcedon, 291. Constantinople, ii. 284. Second Nicea, 345. Lyons, vi. 129. Constance, vii. 426. Basle, 551.
- Councils*, Œcumenic, disputed, Constantinople, i. 465. Third Constantinople, ii. 327.
- Courtenay*, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, vii. 389. Condemns Wycliffe's tenets, 391.
- Courtesy*, source of, in Crusades, iv. 61.
- Courtrai*, battle of, vi. 327.
- Courts of justice*, English, supersede baronial and ecclesiastical courts, vi. 249.
- Crecy*, battle of, vii. 147.
- Crescentius*, Consul, iii. 190. His rebellion, 194. Appoints Philagathus Pope, 195. His ambition — beheaded by Otho III., 197.
- Crimes* made capital by Christianity, i. 511. Commuted for money, 537.
- Crimes of clergy*, iv. 330.
- Crucifix*, viii. 471.
- Crucifixion* abolished by Constantine, i. 511.
- Crusade*, First, iv. 31. Preached by St. Bernard, 250. Disasters of, 254. Of Barbarossa, 447. Preached by Fulk of Neuilly, v. 81. Of Cery, 86. Against heretics in south of France, 175, 179. Advance of, 186. Cruelties of, 187. Its successful progress, 194. Of Louis VIII. of France, 222. Urged by Pope Honorius III., 236. Delays, and indifference to, 301. Against Emperor Frederick II., 484. Of St. Louis, vi. 24. In Cyprus, 25; and at Damietta, 26. Its disastrous end, 27. Against Manfred of Sicily, 43. Against Sicily, 159. Against the Colonnas, 227. Against Pagans in Prussia, 537. Against Dolcinites, vii. 46. Against Moors, projected by Philip de Valois, 114. Of Pope against Pope, 396. Against Hussites, 545.

DALMATIUS.

- Crusades*, iv. 15. Earlier schemes of, 24. Determined at Clermont, 31. Their causes and results, 32, 34. The heroic age of Christianity, 35. Incidents of, 37. Cruelties during, 37. Estrange Eastern Empire, 38. Increase Papal power, 41. Increase wealth of clergy, 46. At first defensive, 49. Afterwards aggressive, 51. Against heretics, 52. Against the Pope's enemies, 53. In America, 53. The source of chivalry, 54. Blend war and religion, 59. Their effect in Germany, 68. A resource of Papal policy, 464. Their failure, v. 73, vi. 83. Taxation of clergy for, v. 79. Indifference to, 78, 126. Papal emoluments from, 319. Expire with Gregory X., vi. 133. Close of, 177. Change in character of, 387. Races united by, viii. 370. Effects of on architecture, 440.
- Crusaders*, their want of funds for equipment, iv. 47. In Germany, 68. Their dissensions, v. 74. At Venice, 90. At Zara, 97. Their treaty with Alexis, 99. Their embassy to Innocent III., 100. Sail for Constantinople, 102. Take Constantinople, 103. Their excesses, 107.
- Crusading vows*, princes fettered by, iv. 44.
- Cup*, administration of to laity, vii. 484.
- Cupolas*, viii. 421.
- Customs of Clarendon*. See Clarendon.
- Cyprian*, Bishop of Carthage, the parent of Latin Christianity, i. 81. His contest with Novatus, 81. With Novatian, 83. On the unity of the Church — admits the Roman Bishop's superiority, 87. His contest with Pope Stephen, 88. His martyrdom, 90.
- Cyprus*, Frederick II. in, v. 349. St. Louis at, vi. 25.
- Cyril*, Bishop of Alexandria, opposes Nestorius, i. 210. His character — persecutes Novatians, 211. The Jews, 211. Ferocity of his partisans, 213. His jealousy of Constantinople, 216. His epistles, 216, 217. His violence rebuked by Theodosius, 225. At Ephesus, 233. Returns to Alexandria, 245. His contest with Syrian bishops, 247; and treaty of peace, 248.
- Cyril* (or Constantine), missionary to Bulgaria, iii. 118. To Moravia, 123. Recognized in Rome — his Moravian version of Scriptures, 125, 126.

D.

- Demonology*, viii. 196.
- Dalmatius* opposes Nestorius, i. 241.

DAMASCUS.

- Damascus*, fall of. ii. 157.
Damasus, I., Pope, i. 108. Tumults at his election, 110. His violence, 111.
Damasus II., Pope, iii. 239.
Damiani, Peter, iii. 245, 289. Made Cardinal, 318. His mission to Milan, 319. Condemns clerical marriages, 320. His letter to Hanno of Cologne, 330. At Council of Augsburg, 332. Contrasted with Hildebrand, 337.
Damietta, taken by Crusaders, v. 287. Retaken, 289. Occupied by St. Louis, vi. 28. Siege of — capitulates to Saracens, 27.
Dandolo, Doge of Venice, v. 88. His dealings with Crusaders, 91. Takes the Cross, 92. At Zara, 97. At Constantinople, 110.
Danegelt, iv. 328.
Danes in England, iii. 144.
Daniel the hermit, i. 319. Resists Basiliscus, and overthrows his empire, 322.
Dante on abdication of Celestine V., vi. 195. "De Monarchia," 521. Doctrines of, 522. His lines on Dolcino, vii. 49. His Hell, viii. 224. Creator of Italian literature, 338. Compared with Tacitus, 343. The religious poet, 344. His Ghibellinism, 345.
Death, state after, ideas of, ii. 100.
De Bosham, Becket's reader, iv. 348, 353. His advice, 384.
Decamerone, viii. 346. The example of pure Italian, 348.
Decius, persecution by, i. 81. Puts to death Pope Fabianus, 82.
De Clare, house of, quarrel with Becket, iv. 329, 334.
Decretal, the first, condemns marriage of clergy, i. 120.
Decretals, False, iii. 58. Their character, 59. Authorship of unknown, 60. The period of their appearance, 63. Accepted by clergy, 64; and adopted by Pope Nicolas I., 65. Were a step to Infallibility, 66. Collected by Gregory IX., v. 398.
"Defence of Poverty," viii. 283.
De Gray, named Archbishop of Canterbury, v. 22. His appointment set aside by Innocent III., 23.
"Deliberation" of Pope Innocent III., iv. 510.
Delinquencies of clergy, i. 551. Ecclesiastical punishments for, 551.
Demagogues, Roman, viii. 114.
Demetrius the Despot, viii. 47. His rebellion, 50.
Denmark, Christianity in, iii. 133. Relations of with Innocent III., v. 70.
Denys, St., said to be Dionysius the Areopagite, iv. 138, 206. Abbey of, 258. Patron of France, viii. 213.

DOMINIC.

- Deo Gratias*, Bishop of Carthage, i. 289. Relieves Roman captives, 307.
Desiderius, King of Lombardy, ii. 428. Takes part in Roman factions, 429. His alliance with Charlemagne, 428. Protects the children of Carloman, 442. Attacks the Papal territory, 444. De-throned, 448.
Devils, belief in their agency, ii. 95. Identified with Pagan gods, viii. 197. Ideas of, 200.
Deusdedit, Pope, ii. 286.
Dialectic exercises, iv. 189.
Dialectics, viii. 246.
Diaphold, Count of Acerra, iv. 479. Defeated by Papalists under Walter of Brienne, 491. Takes Walter prisoner, 493. His preëminence in Naples, 494. Swears allegiance to Otho IV., 529.
"Dies Irae," viii. 309.
Diet at Frankfort, vii. 81. At Ratisbon, 84. At Spire, 87. At Frankfort, viii. 94.
Diets in Germany, vii. 128.
Dijon, Council of, v. 80.
Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 91.
Dionysius, Pope, a Greek, i. 91.
Dionysius the Areopagite, translated by Scotus (Erigena), iv. 183. Supposed St. Denys, 188, 206. Writings in name of, viii. 190.
Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, presides over Synod of Ephesus, i. 285. His violence to Flavianus, 289. Condemned and degraded by Council of Chalcedon, 294. Dies in exile, 316.
Diospolis (Lydda), Council of, i. 163.
Dispensations from Crusades, sale of, v. 484; vii. 516, 517.
Dispensing power of Popes, vi. 175.
Ditheism, origin and meaning of term, i. 76.
Divinity of Christ, i. 71. Contests about, 72.
Divorce, repugnant to early Roman manners, i. 500. Its later prevalence, 501. Its effect on Roman society — restrained by Christianity, 501. Regulated by Constantine, and by Theodosius II., 502. By Justinian — his laws on, afterwards repealed, 503.
Dolcinites, in the Val Serda, vii. 45. Attacked, 47. Their brave defence, 48. Distress for food, 49. Extermination of, 49.
Dolcino of Novara, vii. 38. His doctrines, 42. Antipapalism, 42. Lines of Dante on, 49. His death by torture, 50.
Dominic, St., v. 169, 237. His birth and education, 240. Rebukes Papal Legates in Languedoc, 242. Miracles of, 243. In Albigensian war, 244. His Order and Preachers, 245. At Rome — his increasing influence, 248. En-

DOMINICANS.

- Joins vow of poverty, 250. His death and canonization, 252.
Dominicans, v. 237. Their rapid progress — assemblies of, 249. Their extravagant belief, 252. Disputes with University of Paris, vi. 67, 70, 76. Controversy with Franciscans, vii. 58. In Germany, 82. Artists, viii. 480.
Domitian, persecution by, i. 52.
Donatello, viii. 462.
Donation of Constantine, a forgery, i. 94. Of Charlemagne, ii. 448.
Donatist schism, its effects in Africa, i. 262.
Donus, Pope, ii. 288.
Doomsday Book, viii. 147.
Dorchester (near Oxford), see of, ii. 192.
Dragon as an emblem, viii. 201.
Draco, Bishop of Metz, iii. 18.
Duns Scotus (Erigena), his philosophy, ii. 281. His definition of the Real Presence, 283. From Ireland or Scotch Isles, iv. 186. Refutes Predestinarians, 188. His rationalism, 187. Flies to England, 187. His translation of Dionysius the Areopagite, 188; viii. 191. His pantheism, 287. One of the great schoolmen, 254. Obscurity of origin, 276. His logic, 277. His Latinity, 277. His opinions about matter, 278.
Dunstan, iii. 381. His cruelty, 382. Contest with secular clergy, 385.

E.

- East*, state of (A. D. 500), i. 422. Disputes in, 465. State of (7th century), ii. 108.
Eastanfield, Synod of, ii. 220.
Easter, controversy about, i. 64. Settled at Council of Nicea, 65. Question of, in England, ii. 193.
Eastern Church mixed with court intrigues, i. 201. Its questions on the nature of the Godhead, 202. Becomes Trinitarian and adopts Nicene creed, 203. Its continued distractions, 315.
Eastern Churches, feuds of, i. 181. Buildings, viii. 416.
Eastern Empire. See *Empire*.
Eastern prelates, anti-Nestorian, i. 282.
Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, ii. 544.
Ebroin, Mayor of the Palace, his fall — forced to become a monk, ii. 895. Returns to the world, 896. Slays Bishop Leodegar, 897. Assassinated, 899.
Eccelin da Romano, v. 408.
Eccelin da Romano (son of the above), v. 402. Accused of heresy, 509, 510. His cruelty, vi. 52; and death, 53.
Ecclesiastical jurisprudence, i. 542. Its growth, 543.

EMPERORS.

- Ecclesiastics*. See *Clergy*.
Eckhart, viii. 397.
Ecthris of Heraclius, ii. 270. Violent opposition to, 274.
Edmund of England titular king of Sicily, vi. 42.
Education of clergy, viii. 184.
Edward the Confessor, iii. 888.
Edward I. of England, his power, vi. 169, 178. Compared with Philip the Fair, 242. His return from crusade and designs, 243. His measures approved by clergy, 244. Deluded by Philip the Fair — declares war, 247. Rejects injunctions of Boniface VIII., 248. Borrows Church treasures, 254. Enforces subsidy, 255. Compels clergy to yield, 262. Seizes archbishop's estates — relents, 263. Confirms charters, 264. His league against France, 275. His ill success — accepts papal arbitration, 277. His treaty with Philip, 278. His statement of claims on Scotland, 293. Valuation of church property under, vi. 200.
Edward II., hesitates to arrest Templars, vi. 411. His weakness, vii. 848.
Edward III., his meeting with Louis of Bavaria, vii. 180. Gains battle of Crecy, 147. His compact with Gregory XI., 370. His last years, 372. His death, 376.
Edward, Black Prince, approaches Avignon, vii. 201. Popular love of, 372. Dies, 375.
Edwin, King of Northumberland, ii. 185. His conversion and early adventures, 187. His power, 189. Defeat of and death, 190.
Edwy, King, cruel treatment of, ii. 888.
Exfrid, King of Northumbria, ii. 212.
Eginhard, his Life of Charlemagne, ii. 508.
Egypt, Mohammedan conquest of, ii. 161.
Egyptian monks, their ferocity. See *Cyril*, *Dioscorus*.
Eleanor, Queen, her letters to Coelestine III., iv. 451.
Elections, Papal. See *Papal Elections*.
Electors, German, vii. 208. Their ambassadors to Rome, viii. 91.
Elgiva, treatment of by Dunstan, iii. 884.
Elias, Brother, first general of Franciscans, v. 272.
Eloquence, power of, v. 234.
Elster, The, battle of, iii. 484.
Emeric, King of Hungary, v. 71.
Emperors, Church supremacy of, i. 482. Election of, iii. 154. Weakened by Crusades, iv. 464. Two, coronation of, 502.

EMPIRE.

Empire, Eastern or Greek, exhaustion of, ii. 89. Estranged from the West, iv. 88.

Empire, German, Teutonic, or Western, origin of, ii. 458. Vague authority of, 462. Of Charlemagne, threatened division of, 513. Weakness of under Louis, 531. Division into two parties, 537. Relations of to papacy, iii. 395. Its powers and weaknesses, 398. Vacancy of, iv. 495. Last strife of with papacy, v. 321. State of (time of Urban IV.), vi. 82. (Time of Boniface VIII.), 231. Dissension in, vii. 70. Protest of against John XXII., 81. Elections to, settled by Golden Bull, 203.

Empire, Latin, extinction of, i. 314.

Empire, Latin or Frankish of Constantinople, oppressiveness of, v. 104.

England, state of (10th century), iii. 151. Married clergy in, 332. Prosperity of under Becket, iv. 317. War with France, 336. Under Interdict, v. 27. Surrendered by John to Pope, 37. Dominicans in, 250. Innocent III.'s policy in, 279. Subjection of to Rome under Henry III., 314. Italian churchmen in, 315. Resists Italian churchmen, 317, 318. Prepares for crusade, 335. Antipapal feelings in, 433, 470; vii. 238. Contributions from to Popes, v. 493, 506. Reluctant to engage in Sicilian affairs, vi. 43. Affairs of (time of Urban IV.), 86. Barons of, denounced by Clement IV., 101. Subjection of, 102. Canon law in — married clergy in, 105, 106. Constitution of (time of Boniface VIII.), 238. War with France, 247. Arrest of Templars in, 412, 456. Religious liberty in, vii. 214. Wycliffites in, 268. Teutonic, 346. Insurrection of peasants in, 336. Concordat with, 521. Journey of Æneas Sylvius through, viii. 69. Independent of Pope, 177. Civil wars in, 179. Chronicles of, 332, 333.

English Church, independence of, iv. 248. State of (time of Henry II.), 306. Privileges of, 307. Its wealth, viii. 148, 149. Its property, proposed confiscation and estimated amount of, 149. Alliance of with Lancastrian kings, 178.

English clergy of noble birth, viii. 179.

English language, viii. 335. Religious terms in, 369. Development of, 370. Teutonism of, 384.

English missionaries, ii. 247, 258.

English schoolmen, viii. 254.

English wars in France, vii. 201, 351.

Enham, Council at, iii. 335, 336.

Enzio, natural son of Frederick II., v. 331. Vicar-general of North Italy, 447. Marries heiress of Sardinia, 449. De-

EUTYCHUS.

feats the Mongols, 457. His imprisonment, 498.

Ephesus, Council of, i. 229. Termination of, 246. "Robber Synod" of, 236. Absolves Eutyches, 268. Confirmed by Theodosius II., 239. Reversed at Council of Chalcedon, 292.

Equality of mankind, viii. 167.

Erasmus, viii. 492.

Ethelbert, King of Kent, his reception of Augustine, ii. 178. His death, 184.

Etruscan diviners, their incantations against Alaric, i. 149.

Eucharist, undefined belief regarding, iii. 259. Wycliffe's opinions on, vii. 394.

Eudo de Stella, v. 148.

Eudoxia, Empress, calls in Genesic, i. 304.

Eugenius I., Pope, ii. 281.

Eugenius III., Pope (a Cistercian), iv. 244. Recovers Rome, 246. Retires into France, 247. His relations with Roman republic, 261; and death, 262.

Eugenius IV., his election and character, vii. 538. Seizes treasures of Martin V., 539. Commands dissolution of Council of Basle, 552, 558. Is forced to yield, 561. Driven from Rome, 564. His hostility to Council, 565. Negotiates with Greek Emperor, viii. 14. Proposes to remove Council to Italy, 15. His fleet at Constantinople, 22. His reception of Greek Emperor and Patriarch, 27. At Florence, 33. Signs treaty with Byzantines, 44, 48. His fame, 51. Interview with Æneas Sylvius, 58. Ratifies treaty with Germany — dies, 98.

Eulalius, disputed election of for papacy, i. 196. Expelled, 199.

Euphemius, Bishop of Constantinople — contest of with Emperor Anastasius, i. 322.

Europe, its only union Christianity, i. 173. State of (10th century), iii. 149. (At accession of Innocent III.), iv. 472. (Time of Urban V.), vii. 211. Divided between rival Popes, 244. State of communications in, viii. 442.

Eusebius, Bishop of Doryleum, accuses Eutyches, i. 263.

Eutyches, a partisan of Cyril, i. 231. Leader of monks — his ignorance, 232. Excommunicated, 233. Supported by Eunuch Chrysaphius, 234. Appeals to Christendom, 235. His letter to Leo I., 235. Absolved by Synod of Ephesus, 238. Removed from Constantinople, 291.

Eutychianism, repressed by Emperor Leo, i. 320. Revives under Basiliscus, 321.

Eutychius, last exarch of Ravenna, his flight, ii. 334.

EVERLASTING.

- Everlasting Gospel* of the Franciscans, vi. 71; vii. 29. Condemned by Alexander IV., 80.
Bresham, battle of, vi. 101.
Errenz, Bishopric of, iv. 134, 135.
Exarchate of Ravenna, feebleness of, ii. 834.
Excommunication, force of, i. 224; iii. 400; viii. 138. Its frequent use, iii. 400. Letters of, secretly introduced by Becket, iv. 407. Obsolete, viii. 502.
Expectancies, vii. 516.

F.

- Fabianus*, Pope, the first certain papal martyr, i. 82.
Fathers of Latin Christianity, i. 309.
Felix, Antipope, i. 104, 105. His expulsion, 106.
Felix III., Pope, i. 328. His strife with Acacius, 330, 331. His legates at Constantinople, 329, 330.
Felix IV., Pope, his election, i. 448. Death, 457.
Felix V. (Amadeus of Savoy), Antipope, viii. 58. His coronation, 79. Abdication, 102.
Ferrand, count of Flanders, v. 41. Prisoner to Philip Augustus, 47.
Ferrara, meeting of Pope and Greek Emperor at, viii. 27. Plague at, 81.
Festivals of Saints, viii. 215.
Feudal system established by Charlemagne, ii. 470.
Feudal nobility, rapid decay of, iii. 41.
Field of Lies, ii. 540.
Firmilian, his letter against Pope Stephen, i. 88.
Fitz-Stephen, partisan of Becket, iv. 348.
Fitz-Urse, Reginald, iv. 412.
Flagellants, vi. 55. Outburst of, 56.
Flanders, insurrection in, vi. 827. Crusade in, vii. 897.
Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 282. Involved in court intrigues, 284. Treatment of at synod of Ephesus — his death, 289.
Flavianus, Bishop of Antioch, i. 835. Deposed, 340.
Flemish art, viii. 484.
Florence, ordeal at, iii. 851, 852. Anti-Imperialist, vi. 518, 519, 520. Gregory XI.'s negotiations with, vii. 225. Urban VI.'s treaty with, 240. Leagued with Louis of Anjou, 327. Council removed to, viii. 82. Prelates at, 89. Acts of Council at, 47. Dominican Convent in, 482.
Florentius, his plots against St. Benedict, ii. 29.
Flotte, Peter. Chancellor of Philip the Fair, vi. 807. Ambassador at Rome,

FRANCISCANS.

811. Denounced by Boniface VIII., 825. Killed at Courtrai, 827.
Foliot, Gilbert, antagonist of Becket, iv. 828. His character — Bishop of London, 824. At Northampton, 347. At Sens, 357. His reply to Becket, 372. Excommunicated by Becket — appeals, 387, 388. Aspires to Primacy, 390. Receives Papal letters, 408. Preaches at Canterbury, 420.
Fontaines, abbey of, founded, ii. 239.
Forcheim, Diet of, iii. 467. Elects Rudolph of Swabia, 468.
Formosus, Bishop of Porto, anathematized by Pope John VIII., iii. 98. Absolved by Marinus, 101. Becomes Pope, 105. Crowns Arnulf emperor, 109. His death, 110. His mission to Bulgaria, 114.
Fortunatus, rival of Cyprian, i. 85.
Founders of Latin Christianity, i. 309.
Four parties in the East, i. 383.
Fra Angelico, viii. 482. Character of his paintings, 483.
Fra Angelo, vii. 185.
France, Benedictine convents in, ii. 38. Ravaged by Northmen, iii. 131. State of (10th century), 151. Married clergy in, 380. (With Spain) the birthplace of chivalry, iv. 55. War of, with England, 386. Extension of, under Philip Augustus, 538. Under Interdict, 545. Heresies in South of, v. 146. Manichæism in, 147. Legates of Innocent III. in, 167. State of (time of Boniface VIII.), vi. 240. War with England, 247. Insurgent peasantry in, vii. 64. Oppressed by French Popes, 264. English wars in, 351. Concordat with, 521. Wealth of church in, viii. 148. Church in, 174. Its secession from German empire, 350, 352.
Francis, St., vi. 237. His birth and youth, 254. Embraces mendicancy, 257. Instances of his enthusiasm, 258. Appears before Innocent III., 259. Founds Franciscan order, 260. Institutes foreign missions, 261. In the East — preaches before Saracen Sultan, 262. His gentle character, 263. His poetry, 264. His sermon on the Nativity, 266. His "stigmata," 268. His death, 268, 269. Superstitious worship of, 269. Rule of, 273.
Franciscan Order, its foundation and principles, v. 260. Martyrs, 263. Tertiaries, 267. Schoolmen, viii. 273. Artists, 430.
Franciscanism, character of, v. 269.
Franciscans begin to repudiate poverty, v. 272. Their growing wealth condemned by Matthew Paris, 275. Schism among, vi. 73; vii. 28. Hostility of to Boniface VIII., vi. 289. Its

FRANCISCANS.

- causes, vii. 26. Spiritual, 27. Chapter of at Perugia, 58. Becomes Ghibelline, 61. In Rome, receive Louis of Bavaria, 99. Favored by Alexander V., 321. Resisted in France, 325.
- Franciscans*, viii. 273.
- Franciscan* Emperors, iv. 149.
- Frangipani*, Cuncius, seizes Pope Gelasius II., iv. 125.
- Frangipani*, family of, iv. 128, 150: v. 512. Support Alexander III., iv. 429. Intermarry with Eastern Emperor, 432. Adherents of Frederick II., v. 844.
- Frankfort*, Council of, ii. 497. Condemns Adoptians and image-worship, 499. Canons of, 504, 506. Its Independence of Rome, 508.
- Frankfort*, Diets at, v. 292; vii. 81; viii. 94.
- Frankish* Church becomes Teutonized, ii. 893. Its wealth and corruption, 899, 415.
- Frankish* kings supreme over Church, i. 519, 520.
- Franks*, Catholics, i. 878. Converted by Latin clergy, 886.
- Franks* (crusading), their contempt for Greeks, iv. 40.
- Fratricelli* blended with Coelestinians, vi. 291. Strife with wealthy Franciscans, vii. 27. Denounce worldliness of Popes, 54. Spread of their doctrines, 55.
- Fracitta*, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 882.
- Frederick* Barbarossa, his character, iv. 256. In Italy, 271. His coronation, 273. Holds Diet at Besançon, 276. Denounces Papal pretensions, 277. His seeming reconciliation, and march into Italy, 278. His correspondence with Hadrian IV., 281. Supports Antipope Victor IV., 293. Takes and destroys Milan, 295. Makes Paschal III. Pope, 296. Negotiates with Henry II., 333. Pestilence in his army, 378, 480. Takes Rome, 429. Retreats, 431. Defeated at Legnano, 433. His meeting with the Pope, 435. His treaty with Lombards at Constance, 439. Marries his son to Constantia of Sicily, 441. His crusade—drowned in Phidra, 447.
- Frederick* II., his birth, iv. 456. King of Romans, 457. Made ward of Pope Innocent III., 484. His education, 494. His claim to empire set aside by Innocent III., 511. Joins insurgents against Otho IV., 533. Obtains empire, 537. Innocent III.'s guardianship of, v. 276, 277. Takes the Cross, 289. Correspondence with Honorius III., 291. His son Henry elected his successor, 292. His letter to the Pope,

FREDERICK.

294. His coronation, 296. His laws in favor of ecclesiastics, 296. Against heretics, 297. In Sicily, 298. His engagement to proceed to Palestine, 301. Marries Isabella, 302. Correspondence with Honorius III., 303. His character and views, 322. Admonished by Gregory IX., 327. His court, 328. His poetry, 331. Negotiates with Sultan of Egypt, 334. Prepares for Crusade, 335. Sets out and returns—excommunicated, 337. His appeal to sovereigns, 341. His allies in Rome, 348. Arrives in the East, 348. Opposed by religious orders of Knights, 350. Occupies Joppa, 352. Sends embassy to Sultan Kameel, 355. Makes treaty, 358. Visits Jerusalem, 359. His coronation and address, 360. His compliances with Mohammedanism, 363. His letter to Henry III. of England, 364, 365. At Ptolemais, 369. Returns to Italy, 373. His successes against Pope, 374. General feeling in favor of, 375. Makes treaty with Pope, 378. Legislates for kingdom of Naples, 381. Asserts supremacy of law, 383. Condemns heretics, 384. His laws about clergy, 386; cities, 387; and peasants, 388. Appoints Parliaments, 388. His criminal laws, 389. Other laws, 390. Commercial measures, 391. Encourages learning, 392. His taste and magnificence, 394. His evil fame among the clergy, 396. Periods in his life, 397. Assists Pope against Romans, 407. Represses his son Henry's rebellion, 409. Declares war against Lombards, 410. His correspondence with Gregory IX., 412. Gains victory of Corte Nuova, 418. Excommunicated by Pope, 416. His reply, 418. His appeal to the cardinals—to the Romans, 421. To the princes of Christendom, 422. To the commonalty, 425. Pope's reply to, 427. Reported sayings of, 430. His rejoinder to Pope, 431. His proclamation to German princes, 440. War with Pope, 447. Threatens Rome, 449. His circular letters, 452, 456. His naval victory and capture of prelates, 454. Offers peace to Innocent IV., 460. Loses Viterbo, 462. Negotiates with Pope, 463. Complains of Pope's flight, 468. Refuses to appear at Lyons, 477. Declared deposed, 479. His appeal to Christendom, 480. Conspiracy against, 485. His charge against Innocent IV., 486. Asserts his orthodoxy, 487. His successes in Italy, 488. At Turin, 494. Loses Parma—turning-point in his fortunes, 496. His defeat, 497. Other disasters, 499. His death, 500. His

FREDERICK.

character, 501. His religion, 508. Fidelity of his friends, 504, 506. Compared with St. Louis, vi. 81. *Frederick III.*, Emperor, viii. 80. Reconciled to Eugenius IV., 92. His claims on Milan, 103, 104. His marriage and coronation at Rome, 113. Made Viceroy of Sicily, vi. 177. *Frederick of Lorraine.* See Stephen IX. *Frederick of Arragon*, offers of Boniface VIII. to, vi. 216. Crowned at Palermo, 218. His war with Charles of Naples, 219. Successful resistance to Charles of Valois, 220. Defence of Sicily, 221. Excluded from Jubilee, 286. Acknowledged King of Sicily, 331. *Frederick of Austria* candidate for Empire, vii. 70. Taken prisoner, 75. His treaty with Louis of Bavaria, 85. His death, 109. *Frederick of Austria*, vii. 431. Assists flight of John XXIII., 468. Humiliation of, 476. *Free Companies* in Italy, vii. 220. *Freemasons*, guild of, viii. 441. Theory of, unfounded, 441. *Free-will*, the main controversy of Latin Christianity, i. 27. See Pelagianism. *French* in Sicily, their oppressiveness, vi. 147. Massacre of, 156. *French chronicles*, viii. 332, 333. *French clergy*, English partisans among, viii. 174. *French invasion* of Naples, vi. 94-98. *French language*, Roman origin of, viii. 350. *French lawyers*, vi. 241. *French nobles* take the Cross, v. 86. Their embassy to Venice, 88. Their embarrassment, 91. At Zara, 96. Condemn conduct of Gregory IX., 437. Address to cardinals, vi. 320. *French prelates* resist Roman supremacy, iii. 209, 212. Their prowess in attack of Constantinople, v. 106. Their jealousy of the Venetians, 118. Summoned to Rome, vi. 312, 328. Address Boniface VIII., 321. Assent to General Council, 346. Adhere to Philip the Fair, 347. Support Philip against Templars, 409. *French schoolmen*, viii. 255. *French writers* biased against the Templars, vi. 473. *Fretteville*, treaty of, iv. 402. *Friar*, Franciscan, accused of poisoning Benedict XI. vi. 367. *Friar*, Mendicant, anecdote of, vi. 160. *Friars*, Preaching, v. 237. Their firm adherence to Popedom, 442. Their activity and preaching, 442. Contest with hierarchy, vi. 63. Aim at rulling the universities, 64. Subjected to episcopal authority by Innocent IV.,

GENSERIC.

68. Generals of orders, 72. Unpopular at Paris, 75. Their great theologians, 76. Their dispute with seculars, 78. Their devotion in the plague, vii. 197. Defended by Clement VI., 198. Their proportion to monks, viii. 139. Inducements to become, 140. Corruption of, 170. "*Friends of God*," viii. 399, 406. *Friesland*, Bishop Wilfrid in, ii. 214. St. Boniface in, 250. *Fulbert*, uncle of Heloise, iv. 201-204. *Fulda*, monastery of, ii. 256. *Fulk of Marseilles*, a Troubadour, Bishop of Toulouse, v. 171. His hostility to Count Raymond, 201. At Lateran Council, 213. His treacherous advice to citizens of Toulouse, 219. Persecutes heretics, vi. 82. *Fulk of Neuilly*, v. 81. Preaches the Crusade, 82, 83. Effects of his preaching transient, 84. His death, 85. *Fussola*, see of, created by St. Augustine, i. 264. Dispute with Rome about its suppression, 265.

G.

Gabriano, iv. 477. *Gaeta*, Gregory XII. at, vii. 335. *Galeria*, Count of, iii. 303. *Gall*, St., ii. 245. Founds monastery at Arbon, 246. *Gall*, St., monastery of, burnt by Hungarians, iii. 150. *Gallican Church*, rights of, vi. 317; vii. 451; viii. 84. *Gallus*, Emperor, banishes Pope Cornelius, i. 85. *Gaul*, the first Christians in, were Greek, i. 55. Church in, 270. Its disputes, 271. Appeals to Rome from, 272. Religious wars in, 334. Monasticism in, ii. 20. Fall of Arianism in, 64. *Gaunt*, John of, vii. 365. Popular suspicion of, 372. Regent, 375. Supports Wycliffe, 377. Decline of his power, 379. *Gebhard* of Eichstadt. See Victor II. *Geismar*, sacred oak of, felled by St. Boniface, ii. 252. *Gelasius I.*, Pope, i. 348. His letter to Emperor Anastasius, 349. *Gelasius II.*, Pope, seized by the Frangipanis, iv. 125. His flight to Gaeta, 127. Excommunicates Burdinus, 128. Returns to Rome under Norman protection, 128. Dies at Clugny, 129. *Genoa*, Henry of Luxemburg at, vi. 518. *Genoese* side with Pope Gregory IX. — their fleet defeated, v. 453, 454. *Genseric*, his conquest of Africa, i. 263. His Arianism and cruelty, 269. Cor-

GERARD.

quers Sicily — invited to attack Rome by Eudoxia, 804. Sacks Rome, 805.
Gerard, St., at Toul, iii. 269.
Gerbert, his birth and early life, iii. 202, 203. Adheres to Hugh Capet, 207. Archbishop of Rheims, 211. Accused by Papal legate, 212. Placed under Interdict, 214. Retires to court of Otho III., 215. Made Pope, 216. His death, 220. Suspected of necromancy, 220.
Gerhard, Archbishop of Mentz, vi. 232.
German art, viii. 484.
German bishoprics founded, ii. 254.
German chiefs in Italy, iv. 479.
German Church, its dependence on Rome, ii. 415.
German cities, antipapalism in, viii. 392.
German clergy (married), resist Gregory VII., iii. 414, 420.
German Empire. See *Empire*.
German monasteries, ii. 256.
German poets, viii. 367.
German preaching, viii. 395.
German prelates, their pilgrimage to Jerusalem, iii. 333. Resist papal embassy, 410, 411. Renounce allegiance to Gregory VII., 431. Maintain supremacy of Empire, iv. 278. Take part against Innocent III., 518. Divided between Philip and Otho, 520. Remonstrate with Gregory IX., v. 438. Indignant against Papacy, 439. At Constance, vii. 452.
German schoolmen, viii. 254.
"German Theology," viii. 408.
German versions of Scriptures, viii. 367.
German wars fomented by Innocent III., v. 277.
Germans. See *Tentons*.
Germano, San, treaty of, v. 301, 378.
Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople, resists Iconoclasm, ii. 311. His degradation and death, 318.
Germany, missionaries in, ii. 249. Conversion of, belonged to Latin Christianity, 260. Ravaged by Northmen, iii. 133. State of (10th century), 151. Married clergy in, 379, 413. Civil war in, 468. Effect of crusades in, iv. 68. Civil war in, 80. State of at accession of Innocent III., 495. Civil war in, 503, 509. Ferocity of war in, 523. Renewed strife in, 534. Acquittal of Templars in, vi. 472. Interdict in, vii. 123. Asserts its independence of Pope, 128. Rejects Papal authority, 129. Indignant at humiliation of Emperor Louis, 143. Concordat with, 520. State of (during Hussite war), 555. Indifferent to Papal schism, viii. 62. Power of clergy in, 145. Church

GREEK.

in, 175. Separation of from France, 351. Heretics in, 407.
Gerold, Patriarch of Jerusalem, his hostility to Frederick II., v. 353. His letter to Pope, 365.
Gerson, chancellor of Paris — at Pisa vii. 315. Opposes friars, 326. Head of French deputies, 450. His arrival at Constance, 461. His maxims, 471. Joins in proceedings against Jerome of Prague, 502. His exile and death, 503, 509.
Ghibellines, iv. 480; v. 410. Their hatred to Boniface VIII., vi. 293. Great chiefs of, vii. 71. Ascendency of, (time of Gregory XI.,) 221.
Ghibellines and Guelfs, iv. 438; v. 304, vi. 53, 84, 179, 221; vii. 71. In Milan, vi. 514.
Ghiberti, viii. 462.
Gilbert de la Porée, iv. 248.
Gilbert, Prior, first Dominican preacher in England, v. 250.
Gillas, St., monks of, their barbarism, iv. 209.
Giordano, Patrician of Rome, iv. 242.
Giotto, his works, viii. 476. Allegorical paintings, 478.
Glass introduced in England, ii. 209.
Godfathers, i. 498; ii. 233.
Godfrey of Lorraine, iii. 247. His penance, 248. Marries Beatrice of Tuscany, 286. Raises insurrection in Germany, 288. Marquis of Tuscany, 293. Arbitrates between rival Popes, 327, 328.
Godfrey of Boulogne, iv. 82. Refuses to be crowned, 88.
Golden Bull, v. 72; vii. 208.
Golden Legend, viii. 308.
Golden Rose, vii. 464.
Goliards, viii. 326, 330.
Goliath, on the Last Judgment, viii. 330.
"Good Estate," laws of, vii. 163.
Gothic architecture, viii. 437. Its rapid rise and extension, 438. Contemporaneous with Crusades, 440. National features in, 443. Italian, 444. Symbolism of, 447. Mysteries represented in, 449.
Gothic cathedrals, viii. 446.
Gothic, name of, viii. 443.
Goths request leave to settle in Eastern Empire, i. 373. Their partial conversion, 374. Their divisions, 375; become Christian, 376. Arianism of, 413. Take Rome, 472.
Gotschalk, iv. 182. Persecution of, 184.
Graco-Arabic philosophy, viii. 252.
Gratian, Papal legate, iv. 339. Takes Becket's part, 391-393.
Greek authors, translations of, viii. 123, 124.
Greek books introduced through the Arabic, viii. 242.

GREEK.

Greek Christianity, speculative character of, i. 20. Not aggressive, 22. Decay of, 23. Remains a peculiar faith, 24. Compared with Latin, 25.
Greek Christians in Italy, v. 385.
Greek Church, its separation from the Latin, i. 96. Estranged by conquest of Constantinople, v. 118. Toleration to, 122. Admits supremacy of Rome, vi. 129. Ambassadors of, at Lyons, 181. Returns to independence, 187. Attempted reconciliation of, vii. 535; viii. 14. Treaty, 44, 45. Treaty resisted in the East, 49, 50.
Greek Empire. See *Empire*.
Greek fire, ii. 306, 310.
Greek language, its prevalence, i. 54. The language of speculative controversies, 60. Study of, viii. 250, 251.
Greek learning, 491, 492.
Greek monasticism, i. 23.
Greek prelates, chimerical views of, viii. 20. Embark for Italy, 23. Their voyage, 24. At Ferrara, 27. Their discontent, 29. Jealousies among, 32. Removed to Florence, 33. Their discussions, 43. Sign treaty, 44, 45.
Greek Testament, viii. 492.
Greek theology, its subtilty of definitions of the Godhead, i. 24.
Greeks in South Italy, iii. 276.
Gregory I., (the Great,) ii. 42. The father of mediæval Papacy, 44. His birth and early sanctity, 44. Becomes abbot, 46. His severe discipline, 47. His design of converting Britain, 48. Sent to Constantinople, 49. His "Magna Moralia," 50. His return to Rome, 51. Is made Pope, 52. Retains his love of monkhood, 54. Settles the Church services, 55. His preaching—improves church music, 57. His administration, 57. His almsgiving, 59. Enforces discipline in the Church, 62. Converts Spain to orthodoxy, 64. Opposes Donatism in Africa, 66. Sends Augustine to Britain, 67, 178. His gentleness and forbearance to heathens, 68. Humanity to Jews, 68. Tries to check slave-trade, 69. Letters of, 71, 72. His temporal power, 73. State of Rome at his accession, 73. Defends Rome and obtains peace, 78. His influence with Theodelinda—effects conversion of Lombards, 80. Letter about monastics, 81. His adulation to Phocas, 83. Blinded by ecclesiastical zeal, 87. His death, 87. His epitaph, 88. His praise of celibacy, 93. His policy in Britain, 181.
Gregory II., ii. 311. His letter to Emperor Leo, 312. Its strange arguments, 313. Its defiant language, 314. His second letter, 317. His love of images,

GREGORY.

374. His peaceful labors, 374. His supposed danger of assassination, 377. His meeting with Liutprand, 380. Contributes to separate Rome from Empire, 380. His death, 382.
Gregory III., ii. 323. Sends embassy to Constantinople, 352. Condemns Iconoclasts, 383. An image-worshipper, 384. Appeals for aid to Charles Martel, 386. His offers to Charles, 391. His death, 402.
Gregory IV., adheres to sons of Louis the Pious, ii. 540. Visits the camp of Louis, 541.
Gregory VI., Pope by purchase, iii. 231. Deposed by Henry III., 233.
Gregory VII., (Hildebrand,) iii. 240. Papal Legate at Tours, 267. Proposes Gebhard for Pope, 285. Elected Pope, 353. Confirmed by Henry IV., 357. His birth and youth, 364. At Clugny, 366. His influence, 367. His designs, 369. His decrees against simony and marriage of clergy, 389. His letters to Philip I. of France, 390. To William the Conqueror, 392. His claims of supremacy, 393, 394. His demands on Emperor Henry IV., 407, 410. Calls Synod on investitures, 414. His breach with Henry IV., 417. His harshness to married clergy, 420. Hatred against, 423. Seised by Cencius, 425. Rescued, 426. His letter to Henry IV., 427. His deposition declared, 432. His speech to Council, 435. Interdicts and deposes Henry IV., 437. His manifesto, 444. Letters to Germany, 445, 446. At Canosa, 453. Imposes terms, 457. Absolves Henry, 458. His embarrassment, 466. Charged with guilt of civil war, 469. His conduct in German wars, 472. Acquits Berengar of heresy, 476. Predicts Henry's death, 481. Is declared to be deposed, 482. His critical position and intrepidity, 486. Besieged in Rome, 487. Rejects terms of peace, 489. Obtains succors in money from Normans, 491. In St. Angelo, 492. Rescued by the Normans, 493. Retires from Rome, 496. His death and character, 496. His system, 497. His schemes against Mohammedanism, iv. 24.
Gregory VIII., iv. 444, 445.
Gregory IX., (Ugolino,) v. 321. His first act, 324. His letter to the Lombards, 327. Incensed at delay of Crusade, 336. His declaration against Frederick II., 337. Excommunicates Frederick, 337, 341, 344. Driven from Rome, 345. His inveteracy against Frederick, 347. Denounces treaty with Saracens, 367. His letter to Albert of Austria, 367. Invades Apulia, 370. Raises war

GREGORY.

against Frederick, 371. Disapproved by Christendom, 374. Returns to Rome, 378. His treaty with Frederick, 378. Promulgates the Decretals, 398. His intrigues with Lombards, 404. His correspondence with Frederick, 411. Pronounces excommunication, 416. Reply to Frederick, 427. Exactions from English clergy, 434. Offers empire to Robert of France, 436. His war with Emperor, 447. His solemn procession at Rome, 449. Summons Council to Rome, 452. His death, 456. Places Inquisition under Friars, vi. 84. Favors University of Paris, 66.

Gregory X., his election and views, vi. 123, 124. His measures of pacification, 125. Approves election of Rodolph of Hapsburg, 127. Holds Council of Lyons, 129. Regulates Papal elections, 131. His death, 133.

Gregory XI., offers to mediate between France and England, vii. 219. His disasters, 221. His mercenary force in Italy, 222. His voyage to Italy, 224. His authority rejected, 225. His death, 226. His compact with Edward III., 270. Proceeds against Wycliffe, 380.

Gregory XII., vii. 296. His letter to rival Pope, 297. His doubtful conduct, 298. His excuses, 299; and delays, 301. In Venetian territory, 307. His Council, 312. Declared deposed at Pisa, 317. His retreat at Gaeta—flies to Rimini, 338. His deputies at Constance, 457.

Gregory, Antipope, iii. 224.

Grim, Edward, tries to defend Becket, iv. 415.

Grimoald, Duke of Benevento, ii. 452.

Grossete, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, v. 524. His strictness, 525. Appears before Pope Innocent IV. at Lyons, 528. Resists command of Pope, 528. His death and reputed sanctity, 529.

Groves, sacred, of Teutons, i. 361, 362.

Gualberto, John, Abbot of Vallombrosa, iii. 350.

Gualo, Cardinal, Papal Legate in England, v. 313.

Guelf, Duke of Bavaria, opposes Henry IV., iii. 514. His breach with Papal party, 522. Joins crusade, iv. 70.

Guelf, of Bavaria, the younger, marries Matilda of Tuscany, iii. 512. Quarrels with her, 521. Obtains possession of Tuscany, iv. 263.

Guelfs in Italy, iv. 480. Resist Henry of Luxemburg, vi. 518.

Guelfs and Ghibellines, iv. 433; v. 304; vi. 53, 84, 179, 221; vii. 71. In Milan, vi. 514.

Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, iii. 424. His strife with Gregory VII., 433, 439. Antipope, 433. Consecrated at Rome,

HADRIAN.

492. Crowns Henry IV. Emperor, 493. Driven out by Victor III. and the Normans, 506. Maintains himself in Rome, 517. Condemned at Council of Piacenza, 520. Finally excluded from Rome, 522. His death, iv. 67.

Guido, Duke of Spoleto, his attempt on Burgundy, iii. 103. His wars in Italy, 104. Flight and death, 107.

Guido, Archbishop of Milan, iii. 312. His timidity, 319. Strife with Ariald, 344. Resigns his see, 347. Dies, 348.

Guido di Montefeltro, his advice to Boniface VIII., vi. 225, 229.

Guido della Torre, in Milan, vi. 514, 515.

Guiscard, Robert, iii. 801. Attacks Greek Empire, 486. Sends succor to Pope Gregory VII., 491. Advances on Rome, 493. Fires the city, 494. His severity to Romans, 496.

Gundebald, Burgundian prince, slays his brothers, i. 379, 383. Saves his niece Clotilda, 379. Becomes tributary to Clovis, 383.

Gundicar, the Burgundian, i. 379.

Gunther, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 43. Excommunicated by Nicolas I., 47. Retires to France, 48. Denounces the Pope, 49. Abandoned by Lothair, 50. His humiliation and death, 69.

Gunther, of Schwartzenburg, elected Emperor—resigns—his death, vii. 147.

Guy, Count of Flanders, vi. 267. Abandoned by Edward I., 299. Imprisonment of, 306, 307.

H.

Hadrian I., ii. 441. Attacked by Desiderius, 444. Sends to Charlemagne, 445. Endowed by Charlemagne with territories, 448. Lord of the Exarchate, 449. His death, 453. His deference to Charlemagne, 504.

Hadrian II., condemns Photius, iii. 35. His reception of Lothair II., 69. Adheres to Louis II. against Charles the Bald, 71. His letter to Charles the Bald, 74. Abandons Carloman, 73. His death, 80.

Hadrian IV. (Nicolas Breakspear), iv. 263. His mission to Norway, 263. Grants Ireland to Henry II., 264. Places Rome under Interdict, 265. Puts to death Arnold of Brechia, 270. His fear of Frederick Barbarossa, 272. Crowns him, 273. Alliance with William of Sicily, 274. His Legates at Besançon, 276. Seeming reconciliation with Frederick, 278. His correspondence, 278; and demands, 281. His firmness, 283. His secret treaty with Lombard cities—his death, 285, 286.

HADRIAN.

- Hadrian V.*, vi. 134.
Hæretico de Comburendo, statute, vii. 410.
Hakim, Sultan of Egypt, persecutes pilgrims, iv. 21.
Hallam, Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, at Constance, vii. 451. Supports Emperor, 465. Condemns punishment of death for heresy, 501. His death, 512.
Hamburg and Bremen, Archbishopric of, iii. 140.
Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 329. Carries off young Emperor Henry IV., 330. Becomes unpopular, 332. His strife with Adalbert of Bremen, 333. His power, 339. Insurrection against, 411. His vengeance, 412.
Harding, Stephen, founder of Cistercian order, iv. 161.
Harold, Prince of Denmark, baptized at Ingelheim, iii. 133.
Harckwood, Captain of Free Company, vii. 220.
Hartzburg, stronghold of Henry IV., iii. 408. Burnt by Saxons, 409.
Heathenism extinct under Gregory I., ii. 89.
Heaven, viii. 228. Dante's theory of, 229.
Hebrew Scriptures, viii. 492.
Hegira, ii. 129.
Heidelberg, Pope John XXIII. imprisoned at, vii. 480.
Heimburg, Gregory of, viii. 93.
Helena, Empress, ii. 339.
Heliand, The, viii. 367.
Hell, tales of visits to, ii. 101. Ideas of, viii. 222. Dante's, 224.
Heloisa, iv. 201. Her devotion to Abélard, 201. Her marriage—takes the veil, 203, 204. Prioress of Argenteuil—Abbess of the Paraclete—her letters, 210. Buries Abélard, 220.
Henoticon of Zeno, its temporary success, i. 323. Satisfies no party, 327.
Henry II., Emperor, iii. 222. His coronation, 224. Overruns Apulia and takes Capua, 226.
Henry III., Emperor, tumults at his coronation, iii. 228. Degrades the three Popes, 233. His coronation and oath, 237. His commanding character, 239. His war with Hungary, 272. His meeting with Leo IX., 273. Marches into Italy, 286. Recalled to Germany, 287. Death of, 288.
Henry IV., Emperor, his abduction by Archbishop Hanno, iii. 330. His resentment, 333. Favors Adalbert of Bremen, 334. His minority, 339. Confirms election of Gregory VII., 357. His character, 403. His marriage, 403. His war with the Saxons, 404. Takes refuge in Worms—regains his power, 406. His breach with Gregory VII.,

HENRY.

418. Summoned to Rome, 428. Calls Diet at Worms, 431. Declares Pope's deposition, 432. Letter to clergy and people of Rome, 433. Deposed and interdicted by Pope, 437. Conspiracy against, 440. Deserted by prelates, 442. His desperation, 443. Retires to Spire, 450. In Burgundy, 451. At Canosa, 456. His degrading submission, 457; and conditional absolution, 459. Retires to Reggio, 462. Grows in power, 465. His craft, 467. Reaction in favor of, 470. Invades Swabia, 471. His successes over Rudolph, 478. Again excommunicated, 478. Renounces Gregory's authority, 482. Defeated at the Elster—marches into Italy, 484. Besieges Rome, 487. Proposes terms, 488. Wastes Tuscany, 490. Obtains possession of Rome—crowned by Antipope, 492. Retires before Normans, 493. Renews war with Matilda, 513. His difficulties in Germany, 514. His son Conrad's rebellion, 515. Disinherits Conrad, iv. 68. Protects Jews, 71. Makes Henry his heir—his prosperity, 72. Proclaims peace of the Empire, 73. Fails to acknowledge Paschal, 74. His excommunication renewed, 75. His son Henry rebels against him, 79. Deserted by his followers, 81. Deceived by his son—made prisoner, 82. His humiliation, 83. Popular feeling in his favor, 84. Recovers strength—keeps Easter at Liège, 85. His death—treatment of his remains, 86-88. His funeral finally celebrated, 114.
Henry V., made heir to Empire, iv. 72. Rebels against his father, 79. His hypocrisy, 81; and treachery, 82. Imprisons his father, 83. Elected Emperor, 84. Besieges Cologne, 86. His treatment of his father's remains, 87. Invites Paschal II. into Germany, 91. Asserts right of investiture, 92. Holds Diet at Ratisbon, and collects his forces, 93. Enters Italy and destroys Novara, 95. Advances on Rome, 96. His treaty with Pope—gives up investiture, 98. His procession to St. Peter's, 100. Hollowness of his compact, 101. Imprisons Pope, 104. Contest with Romans, 104. Treaty with Pope, 107. Crowned by Paschal II., 108. Returns to Germany, 109. Excommunicated by Council of Vienne, 112. Celebrates his father's funeral, 114. Enters Italy—takes possession of Tuscany, 122. Advances to Rome, 123. His meeting with Calixtus II., 135. His affairs in Germany, 141. Treaty with Saxons, 143. Concordat with the Pope, 144. His death, 149.
Henry VI., marries Constantia, heiress of

HENRY.

- Sicily**—his ferocity, iv. 441. Anecdote of his coronation, 449. Destroys Tusculum—his war with Tancred, 449. Imprisons Richard Cœur de Lion, 451. Regains Apulia and Sicily, 454. Overruns Italy—his cruelties, 455. Excommunicated, 456. His power—dismantles Capua and Naples—his death, 458. Buried at Palermo, 458. His pretended will, 491.
- Henry, son of Frederick II.**, elected successor to his father, v. 292. Declared heir both of the Empire and the Kingdom of Sicily, 347. His father's viceroy in Germany, 408. His rebellion, 409.
- Henry I. of England**, complaints against, a Council of Rheims, iv. 134. His interview with Calixtus II., 138. Acknowledges Innocent II., 171. Settles question of Investiture, 304.
- Henry II. of England**, his power and ability, iv. 307, 333. Accession of, 315. Makes Becket chancellor, 316. His blind confidence in Becket, 321. Appoints him archbishop, 323. Is opposed by him, 328. Resists clerical immunities, 330. Jealous of clerical power, 334. Calls parliament at Westminster—resisted by Becket, 334. Summons council at Clarendon, 336. Establishes Constitutions, 337. Negotiates with Alexander III., 341. His measures on Becket's flight, 353. Sends embassy to Flanders and France, 354. Banishes Becket's dependents, 361. Makes overtures to Frederick Barbarossa, 363. Wavers between rival Popes, 364. Cited by Becket, 366. His wrath at Becket's measures, 370. Causes Becket's expulsion from Pontigny, 371. Assists Alexander III. with money, 375. Receives Papal legates, 380. Meets Becket at Montmirail, 385. His war with France, 386. His intrigues in Italy, 388. Interview with Papal legates, 390. Treaty broken off, 393. Renews negotiations, 396. His proclamation, 397. Obtains the coronation of his son, 400. His reconciliation with Becket, 403. Receives excommunicated bishops, 411. His fatal words, 412. His sorrow, 418. Reconciliation with Pope, 419. Penance at Canterbury, 420.
- Henry III. of England**, his minority, v. 311. Accepts crown of Naples for his son, 511. His contributions to Pope, 512. Appeal of St. Louis to, vi. 30. His vanity, 42, 43. His war with barons, 86. His imprisonment, 101; and victory, 102. Reaction against, 104.
- Henry IV. of England**, accession of, vii. 408. His dealings with parliament, 418. Church property under, viii. 149.

HENRIBALD.

- Henry V.**, accession of, vii. 417. Insecurity of his throne, 421. Measures against Lollards, 422.
- Henry, Prince, son of Henry II.**, his education intrusted to Becket, iv. 321. Crowned by Archbishop of York, 400.
- Henry, Count of Flanders**, iv. 354.
- Henry, Emperor of Constantinople**, v. 120.
- Henry, youngest son of Emperor Frederick II.**, his death, v. 515.
- Henry I.**, King of France, impedes Council of Rheims, iii. 249.
- Henry the Lion**, subdued by Frederick Barbarossa, iv. 438.
- Henry of Austria**, vii. 74.
- Henry, Bishop of Winchester**, iv. 305. His advice to Becket, 346, 350.
- Henry, Bishop of Liege**, profligacy of, viii. 168.
- Henry the Deacon**, v. 143, 144. His preaching and proselytes, 144. Resisted by St. Bernard, 146.
- Henry of Castile**, vi. 110. Elected Senator of Rome—adheres to Conradin, 111.
- Henry of Luxemburg, King of Romans**, vi. 414, 511. Enters Italy, 514. Crowned in Milan, 515. Takes Brescia—his poverty, 518. Crowned at Rome—his war with Naples, 520. His noble character and death, 521. Dante's hero, 522.
- Henry of Thuringia, anti-Emperor**, v. 492. His death, 494.
- Heracius, Emperor in the East**, ii. 146. Involved in Monothelite controversy, 267. Publishes the Eothesis, 270. His death, followed by revolutions, 272.
- Hereticiety** denounced by Jerome, i. 118.
- Hereditary clergy**, danger of, iii. 376.
- Heresy** a new crime, i. 483. Under Justinian's law, 512. Under barbaric codes, 541. Statutes against, v. 225. Increased severity against, 228. Is not extinguished, 228. Supported by preaching, 234; and by vernacular teaching, 235. Laws of Frederick II. against, 334.
- Heretics**, re-baptism of, controversy about, i. 88. Laws against, 513. Crusades against, v. 131. Three classes of, 141. Burning of, 148. Laws of Frederick II. against, 297. Persecuted, 402. Procedure against, vi. 33. Persecution of in France, 37. Burned in Germany, viii. 407.
- Heribert, Archbishop of Milan**, crowns Conrad the Salic, iii. 306. His wars, 307. His contest with Conrad, 309. His death, 311.
- Heribert, Archbishop of Ravenna**, iii. 307.
- Herlembald**, his zeal against married

HENRY.

- clergy, iii. 848. His tyranny at Milan, 848.
Herluin, founder of Abbey of Bec, iv. 800.
Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, iii. 247.
Herman of Salza, Master of Teutonic Order, his fidelity to Frederick II., v. 506. His high character, vi. 536.
Hermenegild, Spanish prince, ii. 65. His rebellion and death, 66.
Hermingard married to Charlemagne, ii. 438. Divorced, 441.
Hermingard, wife of Louis the Pious, ii. 525. Her death, 525.
Hertha (or *Herthus*), a Teutonic deity, i. 359.
Herulians, i. 403.
Hexham, church at, ii. 210.
Hierarchy under Charlemagne, feudal, ii. 485. Strengthened by Charlemagne, 497.
Hierarchy of Middle Ages, benefits of, iii. 500.
Hierarchy, strength of, v. 136. Its tyranny, 137. Contest with friars, vi. 68. Power of, unshaken, viii. 180. Celestial, 190. Ascendency of, 428. Jealous of diffusion of books, 496. Decline of its power, 496.
Hierarchy, Anglo-Norman, iv. 304.
Hierarchy, English, vii. 362. Commons petition against, 365.
Hierarchy of France, ii. 392.
Hierarchy of Germany, becomes Teutonic, ii. 516. Aristocratic, 538. Its great increase of power, iii. 40.
Hierarchy, Transalpine, its perpetuity, iii. 41. Supersedes feudal nobility, 42. Sanctions divorce of Theutberga, 45.
Hilarius at Synod of Ephesus, i. 286. Made Pope, 312. Rebukes Anthemius, 318.
Hilarius, Archbishop of Arles, i. 272. Denies Papal jurisdiction, 273. His death, 274. Condemned by Valentinian III., 275.
Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, urges Becket to resign, iv. 246.
Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans, v. 144.
Hildebrand. See Gregory VII.
Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, iii. 51. Accepts False Decretals, 64. Supports Charles the Bald, 72. Letters to Hadrian II., 72, 77. His cruelty to his nephew, 80. Persecutes Gotschalk, iv. 184.
Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, (nephew of Archbishop Hincmar), iii. 75. His quarrel with his uncle, 76. Supported by Pope Hadrian II., 77. Is blinded, 80.
Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, i. 66. Probable author of the "Refutation

HUMFRED.

- of all Heresies," 75. His strictures on Pope Callistus, 78. His banishment to Sardinia, and martyrdom at Rome, 80.
Historical Christian poets, viii. 305.
History, Latin, viii. 331.
Hohenburg, battle of, iii. 406.
Hohenstaufen, house of, iv. 266.
Holy Island, or Lindisfarne, ii. 190.
Holy Land, reverence for, iv. 15.
Honorius I., Pope, acknowledges Monothelitism, ii. 269.
Honorius II. (Lambert of Ostia), Papal legate at Worms, iv. 144. Elected Pope, 151. His peace with Emperor Lothair, 152.
Honorius III., Pope, supports Simon de Montfort, v. 221. Honors St. Dominic, 248. Repose of his Popedom, 284. His mildness, 285. Urges the Crusade, 286. His correspondence with Frederick II., 291. Crowns Frederick, 296. His letter to Frederick, 306. Arbitrates between Frederick and the Lombard League — his death, 308. His relations with England, 310. Assumes protection of Henry III. of England, 311. His claim on English benefices, 316.
Honorius IV., Pope, vi. 172.
Honorius, Emperor, his inactivity, i. 187. Espouses the cause of Chrysostom, 142. Destroys Stilicho, 146. His supineness during Alaric's invasions, 151. His rescript against Pelagianism, 188.
Hops, on Architecture, viii. 413.
Hormisdas, Pope, supports Vitalianus, i. 342. Appealed to by Emperor Anastasius, 423. His embassy to Constantinople, 424. His demands, 425. His second embassy, 427. Excites subjects of Empire against Anastasius, 428. Establishes his authority in the East, 431.
Horses sacrificed by Teutons, i. 361.
Hosius of Cordova, i. 99, 101.
Hospitallers, v. 74. Their opposition to Frederick II. in Palestine, 850.
Hroswitha, viii. 316, 317. Her religious comedies, 317.
Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, death of, v. 20.
Hugh Capet, iii. 205.
Hugh of Provence, iii. 165. Marries Marozia, 167. Driven out of Rome, 169. His palace at Pavia, 171. Conspiracy against, 172. Is deserted, 173. Retires to Provence and dies, 174.
Hugh of Lyons, his letters to Countess Matilda, iii. 504.
Hugo the White, his charges against Gregory VII., iii. 431.
Humfred, Archbishop of Ravenna, de

HUMFRED.

posed by Pope Leo IX., iii. 270. Dies, 271.
Humfrey, Norman prince, iii. 280. Conducts Leo IX. to Rome, 281.
Hungarians, ferocity of, iii. 149. Extent of their ravages, 150. Resist expedition of Peter the Hermit, iv. 39.
Hungary, occupied by Magyars, iii. 150. Conversion of, 271. Affairs of, v. 71. The Master of, vi. 58.
Huns, terrors of their invasion, i. 299.
Huss, John, arrives at Constance, vii. 483. Previous history of, 483. Rector of university of Prague, 440. His reception at Constance, 444. Imprisoned, 446. Abandoned by Emperor, 455. His doctrine, 482. Is urged to recant, 483. Interrogation of, 485. Brought before Council, 486. Charges against, 487. His boldness, 488. Refuses to retract, 491. His writings burned, 496. Degradation of, 496. Execution of, 497. Was a martyr to the hierarchy, 499. Severe treatment of, 506.
Hussite war, vii. 541. Atrocity of, 543.
Hussites, their successes, vii. 546. Invade Germany, 549.
Hymns, Latin, viii. 308.
Hypatia murdered by partisans of Cyril, i. 215

I. J.

Jacob de Mies, his opinions about administration of Cup to Laity, vii. 485. Condemned by Council of Constance, 498.
Jacopone da Todì, Franciscan poet, vi. 196. Verses against Boniface VIII., 291.
Jago, St., of Compostella, viii. 213.
James I. of Arragon, prisoner to Simon de Montfort, v. 208. Subjection of to Clement IV., vi. 107.
James, King of Sicily, vi. 171. Succeeds to throne of Arragon, 177. Makes treaty with Angevines, 215.
Jane, of Burgundy, vi. 533.
Iceland, Innocent III.'s letter to Bishops of, v. 70, 71.
Iconoclasm, begun by Leo the Isaurian, ii. 293. Nature of controversy, 294. Was premature, 296. Important points involved in, 297. Causes tumults at Constantinople, 309. Condemned by second Council of Nicea, 348. Suppressed, 355. Revived by Theophilus, 364. Abhorrence of in the West, 373. Enjoined by edict at Ravenna, 376. Directed against statues, viii. 453.
Idolatry alleged against Templars, vi. 453. Against Boniface VIII., 500.
Jean Petit asserts legality of murder, vii. 507.
Jerome denounces vices of Roman Church,

INNOCENT.

i. 118. His influence over noble ladies, 116. Author of the Vulgate, 117. Retires from Rome, 119. His account of the sack of Rome, 158. Resists Pelagius, 166. Persecuted by Pelagians, 167.
Jerome of Prague joins Huss at Constance, vii. 480. His imprisonment and retraction, 501. Recants his recantation — his condemnation, 503. His courage and execution, 505.
Jerusalem, Church of, always subordinate, i. 180. Violent quarrels at, 313. Besieged by Mohammedans, 158. Capitulates, 159. Capture of by Crusaders, iv. 36. Loss of, 444. Yielded by treaty to Frederick II., v. 359.
Jews at Alexandria, i. 211-214. Protected by Theodoric, 435. Of Arabia, their strife with Mohammed, ii. 121. Their rudeness, 137. Persecution of in France, iv. 22. Massacred by Crusaders, 51. Protected by Henry IV., 71. Protected by St. Bernard, 253. Plundered by King Philip, vi. 256, 330. Persecuted by French peasantry, vii. 65.
Ignatius, martyrdom of, i. 53.
Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, iii. 23. Banished by emperor Michael III., 24. His sufferings, 25. Appears before Papal legates — persecution of, 27. His restoration and death, 36.
Ignorance, religious, of lower orders, v. 231.
Illyricum, church of, subject to that of Rome, i. 279.
Images, alleged miracles in defence of, ii. 310. Precedents for, viii. 453.
Image-worship, ii. 298. Edict against, 306. Condemned by Council of Constantinople, 327. Measures of Theophilus against, 363. Restored by Theodora, 366. Prevails in Italy, 373. Condemned in Western empire, 550.
"Imitation of Christ," viii. 297. Influence of, 298. Not sacerdotal, 299. Remarkable omission in, 301.
Immaculate Conception, viii. 203.
Immunities of clergy, iv. 330. Abolished by Council of Clarendon, 333. Becket the martyr of, 421. Resisted by Edward I., vii. 348.
Indulgences, viii. 226. Sale of, vii. 335; viii. 489. In Bohemia, vii. 442.
Infanticide, laws of Justinian against, i. 505.
Ingeburga of Denmark, married to Philip Augustus, iv. 540. Incurs his aversion, 540. Imprisoned, 548. Reinstated, 551. Neglected, 555.
Innocent I., Pope, i. 134. Asserts Roman supremacy, 135. His dominion over the western churches, 137. Supports

INNOCENT.

Chrysostom, 139. Present at first siege of Rome by Alaric, 149. Embraces opinions of Augustine, 176. Pronounces against Pelagius, 178. His death, 178.

Innocent II., iv. 152. His contest with Anacletus, 153. Supported by transalpine sovereigns, 154. Retires to France, 157. At Rheims—ruled by St. Bernard, 169. Visits Clairvaux—acknowledged by sovereigns, 170. Advances to Rome, 173. At Pisa, 174. Holds Lateran Council, 175. His wars, 178. Condemns Abélard, 216. Insurrection against in Rome, 240. His death, 241.

Innocent III., iv. 468. Elected Pope, 471. His policy, 474; and administration, 475. His wars in Italy, 476, 477. War with Markwald of Anweiler, 481. Establishes power in Italy, 483. His claims on kingdom of Naples, 484. Guardian of Frederick II., 484. Engages Walter of Brienne, 490. Fosters strife in Germany, 499. His demands on Philip the Hohenstaufen, 500. His policy in Germany, 504, 507. Address to German envoys, 507. His "Deliberation," 510. Declares Otho emperor, 515. Forced to acknowledge Philip, 523. Crowns Otho IV., 527. His quarrel with Otho, 529, 530. Supports Frederick II., 532. Forbids divorce of Philip Augustus, 541. Mediates between Philip and Richard of England, 544. Places France under Interdict, 545. Compels restoration of Ingeburga, 551. His alliance with Richard I., v. 18. His laxity in King John's divorce, 15. Quarrels with King John, 20. Appoints Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, 24. Places England under Interdict, 27. Excommunicates John, 30. Declares his deposition, 33. Obtains surrender of England, 37. His commanding position, 40. Takes part with King John—rebukes Langton and the barons, 49. Condemns Magna Charta, 50. Excommunicates barons, 53. Excommunicates Philip Augustus, 57. His death, 57. His measures in Spain, 62. Condemns marriage of Alfonso of Leon—threatens Leon and Castile with Interdict, 63. Crowns Pedro of Arragon, 69. Receives fealty of Arragon, 69. His policy towards Bohemia, Denmark, and Hungary, 70, 71. Urges the crusade, 76. Requires contributions, 77. Fails to rouse zeal, 80. Prohibits commerce with Saracens, 88. Receives Alexius Comnenus, 93. Forbids expedition to Zara, 95. Condemns expedition to Constantinople, 101. Receives

INQUISITION.

addresses of Baldwin and the Venetians, 112, 113. His answers, 113, 114. Sends Cardinal Benedict legate to Constantinople, 119, 120. Recommends toleration of Greeks, 122. Mediates between Franks and Bulgarians, 123. Seeming peace of his Popedom, 133. His measures against heretics in south of France, 166. His letter to Count Raymond, 174. Commands crusade against Provence, 175. His crafty conduct, 182, 191. Receives Raymond at Rome, 193. His hesitation, 206. Holds Lateran Council, 211. Dispute before him, 215. Overborne by violence of prelates, 217. Shows favor to young Raymond of Toulouse, 218. His death, 220. His reception of St. Francis, 259. His character, 275. Sanctions Dominican and Franciscan orders, 280. Review of his pontificate, 276-281.

Innocent IV., v. 459. His correspondence with Frederick II., 460. Enters Rome, 462. Negotiates with Emperor, 463. His flight to Genoa, 465. To Lyons, 467. Excommunicates Emperor, 468. Offers to visit England, 471. His insecurity at Lyons, 472. Gifts to, from French prelates, 472. At Council of Lyons, 473. His address, 475. Declares deposition of Emperor, 479. Claims temporal authority, 488. His crusade against Emperor, 484. Rejects mediation of Louis of France, 488. Attempts to raise Germany, 488. Declares Henry of Thuringia Emperor, 492. Makes William of Holland Emperor, 494. His conduct after Frederick's death, 507. Confers crown of Naples on Prince Edmund of England, 511. Aims at possession of Naples, 517. Manfred's submission to, 519. His entry into Naples, 520. Offers realm to Charles of Anjou—his death, 521. Visions regarding, 522. Resisted by Robert Grosstete, 523. His indifference to crusade of St. Louis, vi. 25. His bull subjecting Mendicant Orders, vii. 327.

Innocent V., vi. 134.

Innocent VI., vii. 200. His tranquil Papacy, 201. Acquiesces in Golden Bull, 203. His death, 207.

Innocent VII., vii. 292. His flight from Rome, and return, 295. Death of, 296. "Innocents, Massacre of," a mystery, viii. 312.

Inquisition founded, v. 225. Of Toulouse, vi. 32. Form of procedure in, 33. Placed under Friar Preachers, 34. Rebellion against, 35. In France—condemned by Philip the Fair, 329. On Franciscan heretics, vii. 55.

INQUISITION.

Inquisitor in France, examines Templars, vi. 403.
Inquisitors murdered, vi. 36. Expelled from Parma, vii. 40.
Institutes of Charlemagne, H. 491.
Institutes of Justinian, make no mention of Christianity, i. 490.
Insurrections, religious, vi. 57.
Intellectual movements, iv. 179; v. 294.
Interdict at Rome, iv. 265. Commanded by Becket, 394. In France, 544. Terror of, 545. Raised, 552. In England, v. 27. Effects of, 28. In Germany, vii. 123. Force of, viii. 138. Disused, 502.
Investiture, iii. 415. Lay, forbidden by Gregory VII., 416. Settled by Henry V. and Pope Paschal II., iv. 98. Settled by concordat of Worms, 145. Question of in England, 304.
Joachim, Abbot, his "Eternal Gospel," — prophecies, vii. 29.
Joanna of Naples, vii. 148. Appeals to Rienz, 168.
Joanna II. of Naples, her conduct to rival Popes, vii. 249. Is put to death, 251.
Job, book of, Gregory the Great on, ii. 49.
Johannitus, King of Bulgaria, his victory at Adrianople, v. 123. Pope Innocent's letter to — his reply, 124.
John, St., knights of, rivals of Templars, vi. 387. Conquer Rhodes, 390.
John I., Pope, ambassador to Constantinople, i. 440. His instructions from Theodoric, 441. Results of his mission uncertain, 442. Imprisonment of, and death, 442.
John II., i. 453. Receives embassy from East, 458.
John III., reinstates bishops in Gaul, i. 475. Intercedes with Narses, 476.
John IV., ii. 272.
John V., ii. 287.
John VI., ii. 290.
John VII., ii. 290.
John VIII., restores Photius, iii. 87. His position, 81. Crowns Charles the Bald Emperor, 82. His alarm at Saracens, 84. His war with Naples, 89. Pays tribute to Saracens, 90. Seized by Lambert — flies to France, 91. Calls council of Troyes, 92. Crowns Louis the Stammerer — his frequent excommunications, 98. Adopts Boso, Duke of Lombardy, 94. Endeavors to assemble council at Pavia, 95. Excommunicates Anspert, Archbishop of Milan, 95. Crowns Charles the Fat Emperor, 97. Proposes to massacre the Saracens, 98. Writes to Charles the Fat — his death, 99. Conspiracy against, 100.

JOHN.

John IX., iii. 112.
John X., the paramour of Theodora, iii. 160. Translated from Ravenna, 160. Forms league against Saracens — crowns Berengar, 161. Defeats the Saracens — his contest with Marozia, 163. His imprisonment and death, 166.
John XI., son of Marozia, iii. 167. Imprisoned by Alberic, 169. His death, 170.
John XII., iii. 175. Crowns Otho I., 178. His treachery, 179. Flies from Rome, 180. Cited to appear — refuses, 182. His return to Rome, and death, 184.
John XIII., expelled by Romans, iii. 186. Restored by Otho I., 186.
John XIV., imprisoned by Bonifacio — his death, iii. 189.
John XV., iii. 191.
John XVI. See Philagathus.
John XVII., iii. 222.
John XVIII., iii. 223.
John XIX., crowns Henry III., iii. 227.
John XXI., vi. 134. Stories regarding his death, 135.
John XXII., election of, vii. 18. His previous history, 19. Establishes Pope dom at Avignon — appoints Cardinals, 21. His briefs to French King, 22. His belief in magic, 24. His avarice, 51. Persecutes Spiritualists, 55. Bull against Franciscans, 59. His Italian policy, 71. League with Robert of Naples, 72. Process against Louis of Bavaria, 76. Excommunicates Galeazzo Visconti, 78; and Louis, 79. His league with Charles the Fair, 80. His deposition declared, 101. Commands prayers in his behalf, 107. Reconciled with the Visconti, 108. Death of his enemies, 110. Accused of heresy, 113. His estrangement from French King, 117. His recantation and death, 118. His wealth and vileness, 119. His character, 120.
John XXIII. (Balthasar Cossa), at Pisa, vii. 320. Character of, 328. Previous history, 329. Legate at Bologna, 330. His election, 332. Quarrel with Ladislaus of Naples, 337. Consents to Council, 342. His interview with Sigismund, 343. His journey to Constance, 430. His policy, 434. His reception of Huss, 444. His supremacy in the Council, 448. Threatening signs against, 454. His cession demanded, 457. Charges against, 460. Promises to abdicate, 461. Demands upon, 463. Interview with Sigismund, 467. Flight, 469. Letter to Council, 470. At Schaffhausen — his complaints, 472. His conduct and weakness, 474. At Fribourg, 477. Surrenders, 479. His imprison-

JOHN.

- ment, 480. Lenient treatment of, 506. Submits to Pope Martin V., 526. Is named Cardinal — dies at Florence, 526, 528.
- John of England*, his accession, v. 15. Divorces his wife and marries Isabella, 16. War with Philip Augustus — flies to England, 18. His loss of Normandy, 20. His quarrel with Innocent III., 21. Oppresses clergy, 28. Excommunicated, 30. His folly and profligacy, 31. Declared deposed, 32. Collects forces, 33. His desperation — threatens to embrace Mohammedanism, 34. His weakness, 35. Submits to Papal Legate, 36. Surrenders England to Pope, 37. His absolution, 43. Second surrender of the realm, 45. Conciliates the clergy, 47. Supported by Pope, 49. Signs Magna Charta, 50. Released from oath by Pope, 51. His war with Barons, 53. Death and character, 58. His surrender of realm declared void by Parliament, vii. 369.
- John Talajaz*, i. 324.
- John*, Bishop of Antioch, attempts to appease Nestorian strife, i. 223. At Council of Ephesus, 237. Resists Cyril and Memnon, 238. His league with Cyril, 249. Alienates his own supporters, 250. Enforces their submission, 251.
- John*, Imperial Commissary at Ephesus, i. 241. Arrests the contending prelates, 242.
- John*, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 337.
- John of Cappadocia*, Bishop of Constantinople, his ambition, i. 430. Universal Bishop, ii. 70.
- John of Damascus*, his origin, ii. 318. Writes against Iconoclasm, 320. His three orations, 321.
- John*, Archbishop of Ravenna, resists Nicolas I., iii. 38. Forced to submit, 39.
- John Crescentius*, Patrician of Rome, iii. 224.
- John of Salisbury*, friend of Becket, iv. 320; viii. 241. His advice to Becket, iv. 362. At Canterbury, 414.
- John of Oxford*, ambassador at Wzburg, iv. 334. Excommunicated by Becket, 369. His intrigues at Rome, 374. At Benevento, 398. Reinstates Becket, 408.
- John*, King of Jerusalem, in the West, v. 301. His quarrel with Frederick II., 308.
- John*, Prince of Naples, vi. 519.
- John of Bohemia* invades Italy, vii. 112, 145. Slain at Crecy, 147.
- Joinville*, Seneschal of St. Louis, vi. 29.
- Jolante*, of Jerusalem, marries Frederick II., v. 302. Her death, 331.

ITALY.

- Iona*, ii. 191.
- Joppa* occupied by Frederick II., v. 352.
- Joseph*, Patriarch of Constantinople, his vanity, viii. 20. His reception at Ferrara, 28. Indignities to, 30. His death, 45.
- Ireland*, papal grant of to Henry II., iv. 234. Examination of Templars in, vi. 468.
- Irenaeus*, Bishop of Vienne, appeases strife about Easter, i. 65.
- Irene*, ii. 339. Empress, 342. Favors image-worship, 342. Summons Council at Nicea, 345. Her intrigues against her son, 362. Seizes and blinds him, 364.
- Irish* founders of monasteries, ii. 246.
- Irmin-Saule*, a Saxon idol, destroyed by Charlemagne, ii. 477.
- Iron* age of Christianity, iii. 154.
- Isaac Angelus*, Eastern emperor, v. 92, 93.
- Isabella* of England, Empress, v. 410.
- Isidore* of Pelusium, i. 248.
- Isidore* of Rossano, viii. 75.
- Islip*, Simon, Archbishop, founds Canterbury Hall, vii. 362.
- Italian* clergy in England, v. 315, 527. Popular threats against, 317.
- Italian* defenders of Boniface VIII., vi. 490.
- Italian* houses of Papal origin, viii. 487, 488.
- Italian* language at Court of Frederick II., v. 394. Of Boccaccio, viii. 348.
- Italian* nobles, lawlessness of, iii. 86.
- Italian* politics, vii. 71. (Time of Nicolas V.), viii. 106.
- Italian* prelates, iii. 170. Decline of their power, viii. 171.
- Italian* schoolmen, viii. 254.
- Italy* under the Ostrogoths, i. 403. Invaded by Lombards, 476; ii. 39. Papal policy fatal to, i. 477. Monasticism in, ii. 20. Weakened by Byzantine conquest, 41. Overrun by Lombards, 74. Invaded by Saracens, iii. 18. State of (10th century), 150. Southern state of (11th century), 276. Northern, violent contests in, 349. Climate of, fatal to German popes, 367. Married clergy in, 378. State of, at accession of Innocent III., iv. 479. Becomes subject to papal power, 482. Strife in cities of, v. 295. State of (13th century), 304. State of (time of Urban IV.), vi. 84. Wars in, vi. 179. Arrest of Templars in, vi. 469. Affairs of (time of Clement V.), 512. State of, after death of Henry of Luxemburg, 524. Defection of from Louis of Bavaria, vii. 108. State of (time of Urban V.), 211, 214; (Gregory XI.), 219. Antipapal league in, 221. State of in papal schism, 237. State of

ITINERARY.

- (Martin V.), 528. Great houses of, viii. 173. States of, under princes, 487. "Itinerary of the soul to God," viii. 274. *Jubilee* (A.D. 1300), vi. 284. Pilgrims to, 285. Every fiftieth year, vii. 139, 156. Its celebration, 185. Irregular, proclaimed by Urban VI., 262. Held by Boniface IX., 278. Numerous attendance at (A.D. 1450), viii. 108. *Judaism*, its hold at Rome, i. 60, 68. Displayed in the Clementina, 61. *Judgment*, Last, Goliath on, viii. 830. *Judith*, second wife of Louis the Pious, ii. 528. Accused of adultery, 532. Compelled to become a nun, 535. Declared innocent, 536. A prisoner, 541. Restored to her husband, 546. Reconciles Louis to Lothair, 548. *Julian*, Emperor, i. 107. *Julianus*, Bishop of Eclana, founder of Semi-Pelagianism, i. 185. His history—deposed by Pope Zosimus, 185, 186. Exile and persecution of, 187. Last years and death, 188. *Julius I.*, Pope, i. 100, 101. *Jurisprudence*, Christian, i. 479, 481. *Jurisprudence*, Ecclesiastical, i. 542. *Justin*, Emperor, his ignorance, i. 429. Adheres to Chalcedonian council—closes the forty years' schism, 430. Persecutes Arians, 440. *Justin II.*, supersedes Narses, i. 475. *Justinian*, revives greatness of Rome, i. 449. Character of—subservience to Empress Theodora, 450. Wars, 452. His conquest of Africa, 453. Intercourse with Italy, 457, 459. His conquest of Italy, 461. His theological interference, 465. Disputes with Pope Vigilius, 467-470. Buildings of, viii. 418. *Justinian's code*, i. 488; viii. 420. Was Christian, i. 485. Asserts orthodoxy—regulations for clergy, 485. Bishops, 487. Monasteries, 488. *Justinian's Institutes*, purely Roman, i. 489. Silence about Christianity, 490. On Slavery, 491. On Parental Power, 495, 504. On Marriage, 498. On Concubinage, 503. Infanticide, 505. Heresy, 512. *Justinian II.*, Emperor, deposed, ii. 289; and restored, 290. *Justinian*, nephew of Justin, assassinates Vitellianus, i. 431. *Juvenalis*, Bishop of Jerusalem, i. 231.

K.

- Kameel*, Sultan of Egypt, negotiates with Frederick II., v. 334. His policy in Syria, 353. His treaty with Frederick, 358.

LANGUAGE.

- Kempis*, à, Thomas, viii. 297. *Khaled*, his victory over Alcaellama, ii. 151, 152. *Khoosroo*, King of Persia, rejects Islamism, ii. 145, 146. Defeated by Heraclius, 147. *Kings in Western Europe* become monks, ii. 407. *Kirkshot*, ii. 283. *Kiss of peace*, iv. 396. *Knighthood*, iv. 56. Religious ceremonies of, 57. *Knights*, the four, of Henry II., iv. 412. Their altercation with Becket, 413. Murder him, 416. Their fate, 418. *Koran*, doubts of its authenticity, ii. 121. Becomes intolerant to Jews, 134. Commands war against unbelievers, 141. (See Mohammedanism.) *Koreishites*, the tribe of Mohammed, ii. 126. Persecute him, 127.

L.

- Ladislau*, King of Naples, his policy at Rome, vii. 293. Repulsed from Rome, 296. Second attempt, 299. His influence over Gregory XII., 300. In Rome, 301. Protects Gregory XII., 326. Occupies Rome, 327. Defeated at Rocca Secca, 334. His treaty with John XXIII., 338. Plunders Rome, 338. His death, 344. *Lambert*, Duke of Spoleto, plunders Rome, iii. 87. Assists John VIII., against Naples, 88. His violence to the Pope, 91. *Lambert*, son of Guido, claims kingdom of Italy, iii. 107, 108. *Lambert*, Duke of Tuscany, iii. 168. Seized and blinded by Hugh of Provence, 168. *Lambert of Hertzfeld*, viii. 333. *Landowners*, ecclesiastical, viii. 148. *Lanfranc* opposes Berengar, iii. 265. At Bec, iv. 299. Made Primate of England, 301. His death, 303. *Langland*, supposed author of *Piers Ploughman's Vision*, viii. 873. *Langton*, Simon, Archbishop of York, v. 54. *Langton*, Stephen, made Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope, v. 25. Rejected by King John, 28. Heads Barons' party, 43. Resists Papal Legate, 46. His conduct in contest with Barons, 50. At Rome, 55. Supports Dominicans, 250. *Languages*, new, favor religious movement, v. 235. Modern, viii. 335, 493. English, 335. Italian, 339. Romance and Teutonic, 360. *Langue d'Oïl*, viii. 356.

LANGUEDOC.

- Languedoc*, heresies in, v. 161. Manners of, 163. State of, 164.
- Lanzo* of Milan, iii. 310.
- Lapsi*, controversy about at Carthage, i. 83. At Rome, 83. Spanish Bishops among the, 90.
- Lateran Council* (Second), iii. 297. Settles Papal elections, 298. Condemns Berengar of Tours, 300. (Third), scene at, 434; iv. 146. Under Innocent II., 176. Decrees of, 177. Condemns Arnold of Brescia, 233. (Fourth), v. 211. Secret history of, 212.
- Latin Christendom*, churches in, viii. 410.
- Latin Christianity* compared with Greek, i. 25, 26. Its main controversy, that of grace and free-will, 27. Its Imperial character, 28. Its centre the Roman Pontificate, 41. Unity of its history, 42. Epochs in its history, 42, 47. Arose in Africa, 56. Tertullian, its first great writer, 57. Cyprian, its parent, 81. Unity of, gradually established, 87. Its dominion arose away from Rome, 123. Was anti-Pelagian — its tendency to predestinarianism, 171; and to sacerdotalism, 172. Indifferent to Eastern disputes, 200. Its three great Fathers — its two first founders, 309. Germany converted to, ii. 260. At Constantinople, v. 105. Weakness of, 230. Culminates, viii. 99. Its appointed work, 100. Learned age of, 175. Its strength and vitality, 183. Influence of, in France, 351. Secession from, 496. Authority of weakened, 497. Its enduring power, 498, 499. Its strength and weakness, 500. Its intolerance — objectiveness of, 501, 502. Tendencies of, 508.
- Latin Church*, separation of from Greek, i. 97. In Constantinople, v. 121. Jealousies in, 122.
- Latin Empire*. See *Empire*.
- Latin language*, prevalence of in Western Church, i. 27, 547. Use of in the Church, iii. 124. Universal language, viii. 160. Maintained by Christianity, 282. Has discharged its mission, 334. Late, barbarism of, 343. Religious terms in, 331. Disuse of, 493.
- *Latin monasticism*, energy of, i. 25.
- Latin race* retains its hold on Church, i. 356. Nations descended from, viii. 499, 500.
- Laurentius*, rival of Symmachus for Papacy, i. 350. Rejected by Theodoric, 417. Excites tumults at Rome, 419.
- Laurentius*, Bishop, succeeds Augustine at Canterbury, ii. 185.
- Laurar*, capture of — cruelties on the captives, v. 203

LEO.

- Law*, three systems of, i. 483. Supremacy of, v. 383.
- Laws* of Theodoric and Athalaric, i. 515. Ostrogothic, 516. Lombard, 517. Burgundian and Visigoth, 518. Salic, 519. Against heretics, v. 384.
- Lawyers*, French, v. 241, 307. Biased against Templars, 473.
- Learning* becomes independent of Church, viii. 491.
- Lebuin* preaches to the Saxons, ii. 475.
- Legates*, preachers of crusade, ii. 427. At Bezançon, iv. 276. Of Alexander III., Becket's appearance before, 379. Meet Henry II., 380. Their inhibition against Becket, 381. In Germany, 515. Their contest with Provençal heresy, v. 168. Their demands on Count Raymond, 197. In England, 313, 316. Peaceful character of, viii. 162.
- Legacies* to the Roman Church, i. 113.
- Legends*, growth of, and importance, ii. 90. Were not mere frauds, 103. Of Saints, viii. 216. Popular, Latinized, 306. Represented in action, 316.
- Legnano*, battle of, iv. 433.
- Leicester*, Wycliffism at, vii. 406.
- Leo I.*, Pope, the Great, his preaching, i. 56. His pontificate and greatness, 253. His early distinction and election, 255. Preaches on Roman supremacy, 256. Character of his sermons, 258. Denounces Manicheans, 259. His contest with Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, 273. His letter to Bishops of Vienne, 274. His authority upheld by Valentinian III., 275. Appealed to in Eutychian question, 285. His letter to Flavianus against Eutyches, 288. Rejects sentence of Ephesian Synod, 291. His letter read at Chalcedon, 293. His adulation of Eastern Emperors — ambassador to Attila, 298, 299. Success of his embassy, 301. Goes to meet Genseric, 304. His death, 309.
- Leo II.*, ii. 287.
- Leo III.*, ii. 454. Attempt to mutilate — his visit to Charlemagne, 455, 456. Clears himself of charges, 458. Crowns Charlemagne emperor, 458. His alliance with Charlemagne, 461. His magnificence, 512. His danger from insurrection, 513. His death, 518.
- Leo IV.*, iii. 18. Strengthens Roman fortifications, 20.
- Leo V.*, iii. 155.
- Leo VIII.*, made Pope by Otho I., iii. 183. Dies, 185.
- Leo IX.* (Bruno), Bishop of Toul — his piety, iii. 240. His pilgrimage to Rome, 241. His election and reforms, 243, 244. Visitation beyond the Alps, 247. His visions, 249. Visits France, 249. Consecrates St. Remi's church, holds

LXXX.

council of Rheims, 250, 251. At Mentz, 255. Returns to Rome, 256. Holds council at Vercelli, 265. Second transalpine journey, 268. At Toul, 269. His third journey, 271. His mediation in Hungarian war rejected, 273. Meets Henry III. at Worms, 273. Marches against Normans, 276. Letter to Eastern Emperor, 277. Defeated, 280. His detention and penance, 280, 281. His return to Rome, 281. Death and sanctity, 283.

Leo the Thracian, Emperor, i. 320.

Leo the Isaurian, early history of, ii. 305. Saves Constantinople—persecutes Jews and heretics, 306. Edicts of against image-worship, 308, 309. Suppresses tumult, 310. Resisted by Pope and clergy, 311. His measures against Gregory II., 332. Expedition to Italy—shipwrecked, 334.

Leo IV., Emperor, ii. 340, 341.

Leo the Armenian, his victories, ii. 355. Proscribes image-worship, 357. Murdered by conspirators, 359.

Leodegar, (St. Leger,) Bishop of Autun, ii. 394. His death, 397.

Leon, affairs of, v. 62. Threatened with interdict, 63.

Leontina city, iii. 20; viii. 127.

Leopold, Imperial Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 518.

Leopold of Austria, vii. 83. His death, 87.

Leovigild, Arian King of Spain, ii. 65.

Lepan, battle of, vii. 568.

Lepers, persecution of, vii. 66.

Letters, revival of, viii. 488, 490.

Liberius, Pope, his contest with Constantius, i. 102. His exile, 104. Restored, 106. Tumults at his death, 108.

Library, Vatican, viii. 123, 127.

Lies, Field of, ii. 540.

Limousin Cardinals, vii. 281.

Lincoln, battle of, v. 318. Parliament of, vi. 295.

Lindisfarne, bishopric of, founded, ii. 191.

Literature, Christian, viii. 233.

Liutpold, Archbishop of Mentz, iii. 274. Insults Leo IX., 275.

Liutprand, King of Lombards, ii. 374. Takes Ravenna, 376. Marches to Rome, 379. Quarrels with Gregory III., 386. His interview with Pope Zacharias, 404. Grants peace, 406. Attacks the Exarchate, 406. Abandons his conquests, 407. His death, 409.

Liutprand, iii. 165. Attends Otho I. to Rome, 182. Ambassador at Constantinople, 186.

Lok, identified with Satan, viii. 198.

Lollards, vii. 404. Their petition to Parliament, 407. Statute against, 411. Measures of Henry V. against, 422.

LXXXI.

Lombard laws, i. 517, 537. League, v. 804, 807. Republics, 405. Architecture, viii. 432.

Lombards invade Italy, i. 472; ii. 39. Their barbarity and Arianism, 40. Their ferocity, 74. Overrun Italy, 75. Converted from Arianism, 79. Powerful kingdom of, 374. Detected by Popes, 375. Their disunion, 429. Rise against Frederick Barbarossa, iv. 431. Gain victory at Legnano, 433. Dissatisfied with truce of Venice, 434. Make treaty of Constance, 439. Wars of with Frederick II., v. 326. Support King Henry's rebellion, 410. Defeated at Corte Nuova, 413.

Lombardy, Iron Crown of, iii. 397; vi. 515. Pacification of by Gregory X., 125. Churches of, viii. 421.

Lomenie, Viscount, process against for wealth of Clement V., vii. 51.

London, bishopric of, ii. 186, 196. Adheres to barons' party—citizens of, excommunicated, v. 56. Populace of supports Wycliffe, vii. 381. Lollardism of, 406.

Loria, Roger, his naval victory over Angevines, vi. 170. Revolts against Frederick of Arragon, 220. Alleged conversation with Boniface VIII., 493.

Lothair, Emperor, iii. 15.

Lothair, King of Italy, ii. 525. At Rome, 528, 530. Asserts imperial supremacy, 531. His rebellion, 535, 540. Emperor, iii. 15. Picture of his homage, iv. 276.

Lothair II., King of Lorraine, iii. 44. Divorces his queen Theutberga, 45. Marries Waldrada, 46. His submission to Nicolas I., 50. Compelled to reinstate Theutberga, 53. At Rome, 63. His death, 69.

Lothair, son of Hugh of Provence—King of Italy—his death, iii. 174.

Lothair the Saxon, Emperor, iv. 152. Supports Innocent II., 154. Conducts him to Rome, 172. Crowned at Rome, 173. Returns to Germany, 173. Conquers South Italy, 174.

Louis the Pious, his monkish tastes, ii. 514. His first measures, 515. Holds Diets at Aix-la-Chapelle, 517, 520. His church laws, 520. Settles the succession, 522. Puts down rebellion of Bernhard, 525. Marries Judith, 526. His penance, 527. Decay of his power, 531. His sons' rebellion, 534. Revolution in his favor, 535. His sons' second rebellion, 540. Deserted by his army, 541. A prisoner—his penance, 542. Reaction in his favor, 545. Reconciled to Lothair—divides the empire between Lothair and Charles (the Bald), 548. His death, 549.

Louis II., Emperor—at Rome—over-

LOUIS.

awed by Nicolas I., iii. 48. His claim to crown of Lorraine, 70. Is supported by Hadrian II., 71. His death, 82.

Louis the Stammerer, King of France, iii. 92.

Louis the Fat, of France, complains against Henry I. of England, iv. 184. Protects Innocent II., 168.

Louis VII., of France (the Young), assumes the Cross, iv. 251. Receives Pope Alexander III., 296. His hostility to Henry II., 354. At meeting near Gisors, 379. At Montmirail, 384. His war with Henry II., 386.

Louis VIII., of France, his claim to English crown, v. 56. His crusade in Languedoc, 210. His second crusade fails, 222. Overruns Languedoc—his death, 223. Deserted by English partisans, 312.

Louis IX. (St. Louis), his treaty with Raymond of Toulouse, v. 228. His answer to Gregory IX., 436. Obtains release of prelates from Emperor, 454, 455. His cold reception of Innocent IV., 467. Attempts to mediate with Pope, 488. His minority, vi. 16. His austerities, 18. Anecdotes of, 19. His virtues, 21. His impartiality in Church matters, 22. Determines on a crusade, 28. In Cyprus, 25. At Damietta, 26. His defeat and captivity, 28. His release, 29. Appeals to Henry III. of England for aid, 30. Deserted by his brothers—returns to Europe, 30. Compared with Emperor Frederick II., 31, 38. Escapes being a persecutor, 32, 37. As a lawgiver, 38. On offences of clergy, 39. Enacts Pragmatic Sanction, 40, 119. Refuses crown of Naples, 84. His death, 122.

Louis le Hutin, King of France, death of, vii. 22.

Louis of Bavaria, son of Louis the Pious, ii. 523. His rebellion, 540. Excluded from share of empire, 548. Unites with Charles the Bald, iii. 78. His death, 83.

Louis of Bavaria, vii. 68. His victory at Muhldorf, 75. Papal process against, 76. His apology, 77. Excommunicated, 79. His treaty with Frederick of Austria, 85, 86. Holds Diet of Spire as Emperor—meditates descent on Italy, 87, 88. His war of writings with John XXII., 89. Declares the Pope a heretic, 94. Enters Italy—crowned at Milan—his quarrel with Galeazzo Visconti, 96. Enters Rome, 98. His coronation, 99. Declares John XXII. deposed, 101. Makes Antipope, 103. Leaves Rome, 106. Death of his adherents—seizes Pisa, 108. Defection of his followers, 109. Seeks reconciliation with Pope, 112. Negotiates with

MANFRED.

Benedict XII., 123. His anxiety for absolution, 123. Seeks alliance with Philip of Valois, 126. Meeting with Edward III., 130. Appoints Edward imperial vicar, 130. His weakness and fear of the Pope, 131. Excommunicated by Clement VI., 139. His vacillation, 140. Accepts terms, 141. Deserted by German electors, 145. His death, 147.

Louis, son of Lothair, in Rome, iii. 17.

Louis of Provence crowned Emperor, iii. 156. Taken by Berengar and blinded, 157.

Louis of Anjou, adopted by Joanna of Naples, vii. 252. Invades Naples, 252. His death, 255.

Louis of Anjou, King of Sicily, assists escape of Benedict XIII., vii. 238. Reduces Rome, 327. His victory at Rocca Secca, 334. Returns to France, 334.

Low Countries, painters of, viii. 485.

Lucifer, fall of, viii. 199.

Lucius II., Pope, iv. 242. Attacks Rome, is killed, 243.

Lucius III., Pope, iv. 439. His death, 440.

Luna, sacked by Northmen, iii. 133, 134.

Lupercalia, continuance of, i. 314.

Luxemburg, Henry of. See Henry of Luxemburg.

Luxeuil, monastery at, ii. 239.

Luxury of clergy, iv. 228.

Lyons, Pope Innocent IV. at, v. 467. Council of, 473. Declares Emperor Frederick II. deposed, 479. Second Council of, vi. 129. Regulates Papal elections, 131. Papal coronation at, 375. Annexed by Philip the Fair, 525. Conclave at, vii. 18.

Lyons, Poor Men of. See Poor Men.

M.

Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 334. His haughtiness to Emperor Anastasius, 338. Deposed and banished, 339.

Magic charged against Boniface VIII., vi. 499. Trials for, vii. 24.

Magna Charta, v. 50. Condemned by Innocent III., 51.

"*Magna Moralia*," by Gregory the Great, ii. 49. Extensive acceptance of, 51.

Magyars in Hungary, iii. 150.

Majorian, his efforts to restore Rome, i. 306. His fall, 309.

Malebranca, Cardinal, vi. 183.

Manasseh, Archbishop of Arles, iii. 172.

Manfred, son of Frederick II., v. 50

MANICHEANS.

- Maintains kingdom of Naples for Conrad, 510. Assumes regency of Naples, 518. His dissimulation, 519. His revolt and flight, 521. His victory, 521. Gains Sicily and Naples, vi. 41. Is made King, 50. His power, 83. Advances on Rome, 89. His defeat and death at Benevento, 96.
- Manicheans*, their obnoxious doctrines — condemned by Leo the Great, i. 259; and by Valentinian III., 261. In twelfth century, v. 141. Persecution of, 190.
- Manicheism*, v. 150. Its vitality, 156. In the West, 159. Survives persecution, 228.
- Mantua*, Council of, iii. 841.
- Manuel*, Emperor of Constantinople, intrigues in Italy, iv. 432.
- Marcella*, follower of Jerome, i. 116. Her sufferings at the taking of Rome, 158.
- Marcellinus*, his apostasy fabulous, i. 91.
- Marcellinus St.*, Cardinal, Papal legate in France, vi. 335. His failure and return to Rome, 340.
- Marcellus*, legend about, i. 92.
- Marcia*, Christian concubine of Commodus, i. 67.
- Marcian* marries Pulcheria, i. 290. Succeeds her in the Empire, 295. Dies, 320.
- Marigni*, Philip de, Archbishop of Sens, vi. 444. His summary proceedings against Templars, 445.
- Marguerite de la Porotte*, vi. 534.
- Marinus*, Pope, iii. 101.
- Mark St.*, church of, at Venice, iv. 435; viii. 421.
- Mark of Ephesus*, viii. 39, 43. Resists union of Churches, 44.
- Markwald* of Anweiler, iv. 479. Stripped of power by Innocent III., 481. His intrigues in Sicily, 485. His hollow reconciliation with Pope, 489. Excommunicated — passes into Sicily, 489. Defeated by Papal troops, 490. His league with Walter the Chancellor, 492.
- Marozia*, daughter of Theodora, her vices and power at Rome, iii. 163. Her contest with Pope John X. — marries Guido, Duke of Tuscany, 164. Destroys Pope John, 166. Raises her son, John XI., 167. Marries Hugh of Provence, 167.
- Marriage* of clergy. *See* Clergy.
- Marriage*, law of, Justinian's, i. 496. Treated as a civil contract — early Roman law of, 496. Prohibited degrees of, 497. Prohibited with infamous persons, 499.
- Marsilio* of Padua, his book "The Defender of Peace," vii. 89. His defini-

MAXIMIN.

- tion of the Church, 90. Rejects Papal pretensions, 92. Councillor of Louis of Bavaria, 140.
- Martin I.*, Pope, ii. 276. Condemns Monothelitism, 277. Arrested by order of Constantine, 279. Taken to Constantinople — cruel treatment of — imprisonment, 279; and death, 280.
- Martin IV.*, his election, vi. 142. His measures in French interest, 144. Proclaims crusade against Sicily, 149. Prohibits combat at Bordeaux, 166. His exertions against Peter of Arragon, 166, 167. His death, 171.
- Martin V.* (Otto Colonna), his election at Constance, vii. 513. His first act, 515. His address, 520. Grants separate concordats, 520. His departure from Constance, 523. At Florence, 525. Generosity to rival Popes, 526. His poverty, 527. In Rome, 528. Strengthens himself in Italy, 529. Condemns Statute of Præmunire, 531. Summons council at Pavia, 534. Prorogues it to Sienna, 535; to Basle, 535.
- Martin*, Cistercian Abbot, preaches crusade, v. 86.
- Martin St.*, viii. 213.
- Martin*, Pope's Nuncio in England, v. 470.
- Martina*, Empress, banished, ii. 273.
- Martyrologies*, the ancient Roman trustworthy, i. 47.
- Martyrs*, Franciscan, v. 263.
- Masses*, viii. 155. Sale of, 181, 228.
- "*Master of Hungary*," the, vi. 53. Leader of Shepherd insurgents, 59. In Paris, 59. Slain at Bourges, 62.
- Matilda*, her war with Stephen, iv. 308-309.
- Matilda*, Countess of Tuscany, a supporter of Pope Gregory VII., iii. 428. Her intercession for Henry IV., 458. Her territories wasted by Henry IV., 490. Visits Rome, 506. Continues firm to Papal party, 511. Marries Guelf of Bavaria, 512. Her war with Henry IV., 513. Disension with her husband, 521. Swears allegiance to Henry V., iv. 95. Her death, 116.
- Matrimonial* questions, iii. 44.
- Matthew Paris* against Franciscans, v. 774.
- Maurice*, Emperor, letters of Gregory the Great to, ii. 71, 81. Jealous of Pope, 78, 84. His law about monastics, 81. Deposed by Phocas, 83. Murdered, 85.
- Maur St.*, disciple of Benedict, ii. 28. Founds convents in France, 36.
- Maximian*, Bishop of Constantinople, a partisan of Cyril, i. 245.
- Maximin*, persecution by, ends discord in the Church, i. 80.

MAXIMUS.

- Maximus* puts to death Priscillian, i. 276. Assassinate Valentinian — marries Eudoxia, 303. Slain, 304.
- Marimus*, a monk, opposes Monothelitism, ii. 274. His cruel treatment by Constantine, 281.
- Mecca*, Sanctity of, ii. 128. Mohammed's flight from, 128. Taken by Mohammed, 132. Becomes his capital, 132.
- Medieval* art closed with Nicolas V., viii. 486.
- Medical* influence, viii. 135.
- Medici*, Cosmo de', viii. 491.
- Medicine* introduced among Arabs, viii. 243. Its connection with philosophy, 244.
- Medina*, receives Mohammed, ii. 129.
- Melchisedek*, Pope, i. 94.
- Melchisedek*, example of, quoted, i. 849.
- Melun*, Council of, decrees against heretics, v. 227.
- Memnon*, Bishop of Ephesus, i. 231.
- Memoirs*, French origin of, viii. 359.
- Menageries* of Emperor Frederick II., v. 393.
- Mendicant* Orders, v. 238.
- Mendicants* hated by clergy, vii. 321. In England, 330. In universities — attacked by Wycliffe, 360. Subsidies to, viii. 157. Schoolmen, 255. Piers Ploughman on, 376. Cultivate art, 479.
- Mendicants*. See Friars.
- Mentz*, Archbishopric of, founded, ii. 254. Double election to, iv. 509.
- Mentz*, Council of, iii. 255.
- Merovingian* kings, polygamy of, and incestuous marriages, i. 396.
- Merton* College, vii. 357. Famous members of, 357.
- Messina* capitulates to insurgents, vi. 157. Besieged by Charles of Anjou, 160.
- Metaphysics* and theology, iv. 195; viii. 237.
- Methodius*, Greek missionary, iii. 117, 123. Archbishop of Moravia — at Rome, 126.
- Metropolitan* Sees under Charlemagne, ii. 493.
- Michael* III., the Drunkard, Eastern Emperor, iii. 23. His correspondence with Pope Nicolas I., 30. His murder, 34.
- Michael* the Stammerer, made Emperor by a conspiracy, ii. 359. His character, 360.
- Middlesex*, church property in, viii. 152.
- Milan*, Council of, i. 102. Archbishopric of, iii. 305. Dissensions in, 310. Tumults in, 317. Church of, asserts right of marriage, 315. Insurrection

MOHAMMEDANS.

- in against Herlembald, 348. Disputed bishopric, iv. 117. Secret league of with Hadrian IV., 285. Revolt against Frederick Barbarossa, 293. Fall of, 295. Ruin and restoration of, 425, 426.
- Heads Lombard league, v. 304. Henry of Luxemburg crowned in, vi. 515. Insurrection in, 516. Claims to duke dom of, viii. 103, 104. Cathedral, 445.
- Milo*, Papal Legate, imposes penance on Count Raymond, v. 182.
- Milton*, viii. 199.
- Minerve*, siege and capture of, v. 195.
- Minnesingers*, viii. 871.
- Minor* Friars of St. Francis, v. 264.
- Miracles* of St. Benedict, ii. 24. Of St. Dominic, v. 243.
- Moadhin*, Sultan of Damascus, v. 346. His rivalry with Sultan Kaueel, 353.
- Modern* languages, viii. 493.
- Mohammed*, his character and plans a problem, ii. 119. His early life, 122. His call to prophecy, 123. His visions, 124. Divine mission, 125. Slow progress, 126. Is persecuted, 127. His flight (Hegira) — received at Medina, 128. His advances to the Jews, 130. His war with the Jews — conquers Mecca, 131. Unites Arabia, 133. His growing intolerance, 134. To Jews, 135. To Christians 135. His imperfect knowledge of Judaism and Christianity, 136. Contemplates vast conquests — his letters to kings, 144, 145. His war with Romans, 147. His illness and death, 149.
- Mohammedanism*, appearance of, ii. 109. Energy of, 114. Its monothelism — similarity to Judaism, 115. Its fanciful tenets, 116. Was not original, 116. Borrowed from Jewish legends, 117. Its four precepts: Prayer, Almsgiving, Fasting, Pilgrimage, 118. Its articles of faith, 119. Progress of, 131. Recognizes slavery and polygamy, 140. Its war against mankind, 141. Demands conversion or tribute, 144. Its energy greater than that of Christianity, 154. Aggressive, iv. 50. Averse to philosophy, viii. 242.
- Mohammedans* not disunited on the Prophet's death, ii. 150. Their conquest of Syria, 153. Fanaticism of, 155. Take Bosra, 156. Damascus, 157. Take Jerusalem, 158. Conquer Persia and Egypt, 161. Africa, 162. Causes of their increase, 165. Extent of their conquests, 168. Their rapid civilization, 171. Their learning, 171. Expansion of their creed, 172. Defeated at Tours, ii. 335. Formidable invasion of Gaul, 400. Permit pilgrimage to Jerusalem under restric-

MOKAWKAS.

- mons, iv. 20. In Spain defeated at Naves de Tolosa, v. 61. Warfare against, 131. St. Francis among, 262. Dissensions among, 384. Anger of, at cession of Jerusalem, 383.
- Mokawkas*, Governor of Egypt, welcomes Mohammedan invaders, ii. 161.
- Molay*, Du, Grand Master of Templars, vi. 391. At Paris, 392. His advice concerning the Holy Land, 394. His confession of charges, 405. Brought before commissioners, 428, 431. Mistled by William de Plasian, 428. His character, 478. Brought up for sentence, 523. His speech, 527. Burned alive, 527. His prophecy — sympathy for, 528.
- Molesme*, monastery of, its origin, iv. 160.
- "*Monarchia, de*," Dante's treatise, vi. 521.
- Monarchianism* introduced at Rome by Praxeas, i. 70. Why called Patripassianism, 78.
- Monasteries*, rules of Justinian for, i. 488. German, ii. 256. Plundered by great prelates, iii. 336. Older, their wealth, iv. 158; and relaxed discipline, 159. Schools of, 189.
- Monastic Orders*, union of, viii. 159. Versifiers, 305. Amatory poetry, 321. Satiric poetry, 324. Historians, 331. Representations of Christ, 470. Painters, 479.
- Monasticism*, Greek, i. 28. Latin, 25. In Rome, 112, 114. Increasing power of, 117. Eastern and Western contrasted, 347. Of early English Church, ii. 206. Was suited to the times, 207. Revivals of, iii. 337; iv. 155. The parent of intellectual movements, 179. Antagonistic to wealth of clergy, 227. Did not instruct the people, v. 232.
- Monasticism*, Western. *See* Western.
- Money*, assessment of crimes for, i. 516, 533.
- Mongols* invade Europe, v. 455. Defeated by Enzo, 457.
- Monks*, Eastern, i. 230. Turbulence of, 316. Their influence, 344. Evils of their tyranny and fanaticism, 345. Originally lay, 549. Law of Maurice about, ii. 81. Resist Iconoclasm, 333. Persecuted by Constantine Copronymus, 335. Contest with Seculars, iii. 335, 336. Numbers of, viii. 139. Corruption of, 169.
- Monophysitism*, i. 312.
- Monothelite controversy*, ii. 266.
- Monothelitism*, its origin, ii. 266. A compromise with Monophysitism, 268.
- Montanism*, i. 68. Of Phrygian origin, austerity of, 69. Embraced by Tertullian, 70.

MONTANUS.

- Montanus*, i. 68.
- Monte Casino*, Benedict's convent at, ii. 29. Besieged by Markwald, iv. 483.
- Montferrat*, Marquis of, joins Crusade at Zara, v. 98. His treaty with Alexias, 99.
- Montmirail*, meeting at, iv. 384. Broken off, 385.
- Monumental sculpture*, viii. 460.
- Morals of clergy*, viii. 169.
- Moravians*, conversion of, iii. 124.
- Moreale*, Fra, vii. 205. Executed by Rienzi, 206.
- Morosini*, Thomas, Venetian Patriarch of Constantinople, v. 111. Confirmed Innocent III., 115. Arrives at Constantinople — the Franks jealous of, 118.
- Morrone*, Peter. *See* Celestine V.
- Mortmain*, statute of, vi. 250. Its objects, 251; vii. 268. A bulwark against Church, 354; viii. 146.
- Moreville*, Hugh de, iv. 412.
- Mosaics*, viii. 466, 472.
- Mosulama*, rival of Mohammed, slain by Khaled, ii. 152.
- "*Mother of God*," viii. 205.
- Movements*, intellectual, iv. 179; v. 234.
- Muhlendorf*, battle of, vii. 75.
- Murder of Becket*, iv. 416. Its effects, 417. Legality of, asserted by Jean Petit, vii. 507.
- Muret*, battle of, v. 208.
- Music*, Church, improved by Gregory the Great, ii. 57. In Anglo-Saxon church, 232.
- Mysteries*, viii. 312. Dramatic — impressiveness of, 316. Symbolised in Gothic architecture, 447.
- Mystery of Innocents*, viii. 313.
- Mysticism*, iv. 223.
- Mysticism and Scholasticism*, viii. 240. In Germany, 395.

N.

- Naples* in league with Saracens, iii. 90.
- Frederick II.'s Constitution for, v. 331.
- University of, 394. Claimants to crown of, vi. 84. Discontent in against French, 107. Arrest of Templars in, 412. Rienzi interferes in affairs of, vii. 163. War in, 251.
- Napoleon*, Orsini, Cardinal, his complaint to Philip the Fair, vii. 16.
- Narni* subdued by Innocent III., iv. 477.
- Narses*, Governor of Italy, i. 475. Disgraced — threatens revolt — his death, 476. Calls in Lombards, ii. 39.
- Nations*, voting by, at Constance, vii. 459. -

NATIVITY.

Nativity, St. Francis preaches on, v. 288.

Navarre, affairs of, v. 66.

Naves de Tolosa, battle of, v. 61.

Nepotism of Nicolas III., vi. 141. Of Gregory XII., vii. 802. Prevalence of, vi. 580; vii. 272; viii. 171.

Neronian persecution, i. 52.

Nestorian controversy, narrowness of its issue, i. 204. Referred to Pope Celestine I., 220.

Nestorianism promulgated at Constantinople, i. 207. Resistance to, 208. Proscribed by Imperial edict, 251. Its remarkable extension in the East, 252.

Nestorius, a Syrian, i. 206. His sermons at Constantinople, 207. His persecuting spirit, 208. Weakness of his position, 219. His letter to Pope Celestine I., 220. Condemned by Pope, 221. Strife with his opponents, 224. His influence at court, 225. Proceedings against at Council of Ephesus, 235. Retires to Antioch, 245. Exiled to the Oasis — his sufferings and death, 249.

Neuilly, Fulk of. *See* Fulk.

Nicea, first Council of, settles the Easter question, i. 65. Its high authority, 266. Its decrees misquoted by Zosimus, 266.

Nicea, second Council of, ii. 345. Its proceedings, 346; and decree in favor of image-worship, 348.

Nicæan creed, viii. 40.

Nicephorus, Emperor, ii. 355.

Nicephorus Phocas, Eastern Emperor, iii. 186.

Nicolas I., Pope, entitled "the Great," iii. 21. His intervention at Constantinople and in France — its results, 22. Sends legates to Constantinople, 25. Supports Ignatius against Photius, 29. His contest with John Bishop of Ravenna, 39. Reduces him to submission, 40. Overawes Emperor Louis II., 48. Domineers over French prelates, 49; and over King Lothair, 52. His triumph and death, 56. His character, 57. Sanctions the False Decretals, 58. His answer to Bogoris, 119.

Nicolas II., iii. 296. Vests Papal elections in Cardinals, 296. His league with Normans, 301. His death, 304.

Nicolas III., his designs, vi. 136. Extends Papal territories, 138. His nepotism, 141; and sudden death, 142. His intrigues against Charles of Anjou, 152.

Nicolas IV., vi. 173. Annuls Charles the Lame's surrender of Sicily, 175. His death, 179. Persecutor of Roger Bacon, viii. 291.

Nicolas V. (Thomas of Sarzana), Papal

NORTHUMBERLAND.

legate at Frankfort, viii. 90. Elected Pope, 100. His prudent conduct, 101. His character and policy, 106. Holds Jubilee, 108. Crowns Frederick III., 118. Suppresses conspiracy, 116. His anxiety, 117. His death, 119. A patron of letters, 121. Founds Vatican Library, 123. Employs translators from Greek authors, 123, 124. His design for St. Peter's, 126. Repairs churches and walls of Rome, 128. His buildings in Romagna, 129. His death-bed, 129, 130. His papacy closed mediæval letters and art, 486. Begins new era, 488. Encourages classical learning, 491.

Nicolas V. (Peter de Corvara). Antipope, vii. 108. His abjuration, 111. Confined at Avignon — his death, 111.

Nicolas, Papal legate in England, v. 44.

Nicolas of Basle, viii. 402.

Nitria, monks of, i. 214.

Nobility a ground for Papal dispensations, viii. 164.

"*Noble Lesson*" of the Waldenses, v. 155.

Nobles, English, alarmed by Becket's pretensions, iv. 334.

Nogaret, William of, vi. 307, 336. His speech against Boniface VIII., 337. In Italy, 351. Altercation with Pope at Anagni, 354. Excepted from Papal pardon, 362. His protest, 377. Demands absolution, 378. His services to Philip the Fair, 380. Absolved by Clement V., 383. Accuses Templars, 393, 431. Prosecutes memory of Boniface VIII., 489. His pleadings, 492. His penance, 503.

Nominalists and Realists, iv. 190.

Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, jealous of Abélard, iv. 208.

Norbert, St., Bishop of Utrecht, v. 148.

Norman conquest sanctioned by Pope, iv. 392. Latinizing tendency of, viii. 368.

Norman architecture, viii. 436. Cathedrals, 437.

Normans in South Italy, iii. 277. Their victory over Leo IX., 279. Their league with Pope Nicolas II., 301. Sack and burn Rome, 494. Vassals of Pope, iv. 128. Learned churchmen of, 299. In France, viii. 353. Become French, 354. In Italy, 354.

Northampton, Council of, iv. 343. Fines Becket, 344.

Northmen, ravages of, iii. 129. In France — in the Mediterranean — sack Luna, 132, 133. In Germany, 133. Their religion, 134.

Northumberland, kingdom of, ii. 185. Becomes Christian, 187. Falls into heathenism, 190. Its reconversion, 192.

NORTHUMBRIANS.

- Northumbrians* accept Christianity, ii. 187.
Novatian, Antipope, i. 83.
Novatianism, its spread and duration, i. 86.
Novatus opposes Cyprian, i. 82. Adheres to Novatian, 83.

O.

- "*Obedience*" of rival Popes, vii. 308, 309.
Oblations, viii. 156.
Ockham, William of, vii. 23, 59. His antipapal writings, 94. Counsellor of Louis of Bavaria, 140. Of Merton College, 357. A Franciscan, viii. 255. Denies Papal authority, 282. His theology, 283, and philosophy, 284. His nominalism, 286.
Octavian. See John XII.
Octavianus, Cardinal, Papal Legate, iv. 551. At Solesons, 552.
Odo, Archbishop, his outrage upon King Edwy, iii. 383.
Odo, Duke of Burgundy, iv. 162.
Odo of Bayeux, half brother of William the Conqueror, iv. 302.
Odoacer, King of Italy, i. 314. His decree at election of Pope Felix, 323. Makes peace with Theodoric—his death, 404.
Otilo, abbot of Clugny, iii. 365.
Œcumenic councils. See Councils.
Oldcastle. See Cobham.
Olive, John Peter, his prophecies, vii. 88.
Olympius, favorite of Honorius, ruins Stilicho, i. 148.
Omar, Caliph, takes Jerusalem, ii. 158.
Orcagna, viii. 479.
Ordeal, i. 540; iii. 45. At Florence, 352, 353.
Orders, Mendicant. See Friars.
Orestes, prefect of Alexandria, endeavors to maintain peace, i. 212. His hostility to Cyril, 214.
Oriental manners, vi. 388.
Orsini, feuds of at Rome, iv. 477, 478. House of, vi. 142, 143; vii. 294.
Orsini, Cardinal, at Conclave at Rome, vii. 282, 283. His death, 243.
Osker, Norman chief, iii. 131.
Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy, i. 403. Its decline after Theodoric, 456. Laws, 515.
Oswald, in Northumberland, invites a bishop from Iona, ii. 191. In Wessex, 192. His death, 192.
Oswin murdered by Oswio, ii. 193.
Oswio, his victory over Penda—his power, ii. 194, 195.
Otfried, viii. 337.

PALÆOLOGUS.

- Otho I.*, the Great, Emperor—In Italy—marries Adelaide, iii. 176, 177. Crowned at Rome, 178. John XII.'s plots against, 179. Marches against Rome, 180. Quells insurrection in Rome, 183. His third expedition into Italy, 186. His death, 187.
Otho II., Emperor, prepares war against Saracens, dies at Rome, iii. 188, 189.
Otho III., Emperor, iii. 190. Visits Rome, makes Gregory V. Pope—is crowned, and returns, 194. Invades Italy—his severities, 197. His great designs, 201. Enters the tomb of Charlemagne, 202. Appoints Gerbert Pope, 216. Visits Rome—poisoned by Stephanus, 218.
Otho IV. in England, iv. 498. His claim to empire, 498. Crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, 502. Appeals to Innocent III., 503. Declared Emperor by Pope, 514. Proclaimed by legates, 516. His coronation at Rome, 527. In Tuscany, 529. Quarrels with Innocent III., 529. Excommunicated, 530. Rising against in Germany, 532. Returns to Germany, 533. Marries daughter of Emperor Philip, 534. Retires before Frederick II., 436. His penance and death v. 288, 289.
Otho, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, iv. 375.
Otho, Bishop of Bamberg, iv. 76.
Otho of Wittelsbach, murders King Philip, iv. 525.
Otho, Papal legate in England, v. 316, 433.
Otho, Duke of Bavaria, v. 438. His fidelity to Emperor Frederick, 489, 491.
Otto. See Urban II.
Ottobuoni, cardinal legate in England, vi. 99. His sentences, 103. Constitutions of, 106.
Oxford, vii. 357. Wycliffite, 391.

P.

- Paderborn*, diet at, ii. 479.
Paganism, extinction of, i. 123, 155.
Pagans, dispersion of, i. 160.
Painting, encouraged by Nicolas V., viii. 129. Christian, 464. Byzantine, 466. Devotional, 467. Cloistral school of, 481. Transalpine, 484.
Paintings, Byzantine, viii. 473. Wall, 478.
Palæologus, Michael, Greek Emperor, vi. 127. Reconciles Greek and Roman churches, 131. Insurrection against, 137. Excommunicated, 144. His death, 145. His intrigues against Charles of Anjou, 152.
Palæologus, John VI., viii. 14. Negotiates with Pope and Council of Basel,

PALEZ.

14. Resolves on journey to Italy, 19. Embarks, 23. His reception at Venice, 25. Goes to Ferrara, 27. At Florence, 38. Returns to Constantinople, 48.
- Palez* accuser of Huss, vii. 485, 490. Entreats him to yield, 493.
- Palermo*, Archbishop of, v. 505.
- Palermo* rises against French, vi. 155.
- Palestine*, sacred places in, iv. 18. Affairs of, v. 346.
- Palestrina* surrendered to Boniface VIII., vi. 229.
- Palmar* Synod, i. 420. Acquits Symmachus, 421.
- Pandulph*, legate to King John, v. 85. Dictates treaty, 88. Prohibits Philip's invasion of England, 41. In England, 50, 53.
- Pandulph*, Bishop of Norwich, v. 316.
- "*Pange Lingua Gloriosi*," viii. 309.
- Pantaleon*, James. *See* Urban IV.
- Pantheism* of Erigena, iv. 187. Heresy of, viii. 249.
- Papacy* rises on decline of Empire, i. 137. Temporal power of, injurious to spiritual, 478. The life of Christianity, ii. 42. Mediæval, its services to Europe, 43. Seized by Toto, 432. Under Charlemagne, 469. State of, at Charlemagne's death, 510. Abasement of (10th century). iii. 152. Sale of, 230. Degradation of, 236. Preserves Christianity, 330. Revival of, 331. Universal reverence for, 362. Relations of to Empire, 395. Its powers, 398. Strife with Empire terminated by Concordat of Worms, iv. 144. Idea of, 463. Causes of its strength, 463. Humility of its language, 467. Satires upon, v. 138. Venality of, 139; vii. 529. Last strife of with Empire, v. 321. Vacancy of, 458; vi. 118, 122; vii. 18. Decline of, vi. 299, 531. Vitality of, 370. Degradation of, 371. Strengthened by Council of Constance, vii. 523. Restored by Nicolas V., viii. 126. Blindness of, 182. Public feeling impatient of, 489.
- Papal* authority strengthened by Crusades, iv. 464. Lofty claims of, vi. 210.
- Papal* claims examined by Marsilio of Padua, vii. 89.
- Papal* court, its jealousy of Rienzi, vii. 175.
- Papal* elections, tumultuous character of, i. 196. Regulated by Emperors, 200. Anomaly in, iii. 152. Violence of, 155. Vested in Cardinals, 298. Regulated at Council of Lyons, vi. 181.
- Papal* extortions, vii. 331.
- Papal* legates, iii. 53.
- Papal* power, based on Friars' orders, v. 442, 469. Controversy on, vii. 60. Decline of, 852; viii. 99.

PASTOURAUX.

- Papal* prerogative, growth of, vii. 516.
- Papal* revenues, failure of, vii. 268. From England, 348.
- Papal* schism. *See* Schism.
- Paper*, manufacture of, viii. 494.
- Paraclete*, the, founded by Abélard, iv. 208. Occupied by Heloise and nuns, 210.
- Paraphrases*, viii. 302.
- Parental* power under Justinian, i. 495. Was never absolute in practice, 504. Limitations of, 504, 505.
- Paris*, university of, vi. 65. Its contest with citizens, 66. Dispute with Dominicans, 67, 70, 76. Takes part with Philip the Fair, 347. Condemns Papal schism, vii. 278. Circular letters of, 280. Resists friars, 324. Looked up to by schoolmen, viii. 255.
- Parish* Priest, Chaucer's, viii. 339.
- Parliament* (of Westminster), iv. 334. Development of, vi. 238. At Bury, 260, 261. Of Lincoln, 295. Petitions against hierarchy, vii. 335. Resists Papal exactions, 338. "The Good," 373. Strife in, 414.
- Parliament* (French), vi. 318. Addresses Pope and Cardinals, 320. At the Louvre, 336. Second meeting of, 340. At Tours, 415. Condemns Templars, 416.
- Parliaments* in kingdom of Naples, v. 338.
- Parma* taken by Papalists, v. 495. Repulses Frederick II., 496. Expulsion of inquisitors from, vii. 40.
- Parma*, John of, General of Franciscans, vi. 72, 73.
- Paschal* I., Pope, ii. 519. Charge against, 529. His death, 529.
- Paschal* II., Pope, iv. 67. Not acknowledged—strife with Henry IV., 75. Absolves Prince Henry, 79. His relations with Henry V., 89. At Guastalla—invited into Germany, 90, 91. His treaty with Henry V., 98. His suspicion and insincerity, 102. Imprisoned, 104. His treaty with Henry, 107. Crowns him, 108. His clergy remonstrate, 109. His embarrassment, 110. His treaty annulled, 111. Confirms excommunication of Henry V., 119. Quarrels with Roman people, 121. Retires before Henry V., 123. His death, 125. Buried in the Lateran, 125.
- Paschal* III., Imperialist Pope, iv. 296. Accompanies Frederick Barbarossa to Rome, 429. In Rome—dies, 431.
- Pastoureaux*, the, vi. 57. Their progress and hostility to clergy, 59, 60. In Paris—at Orleans, 60, 61. In Bourges, Bordeaux, and Marseilles, 62. Suppressed, 63. Second outbreak of, vii. 64. Persecute the Jews, 65.

PATERINES.

- Paterines*, iii. 815. Term applied to Manicheans, v. 161.
- Patricianism*, i. 78. See Monarchianism.
- Pavia* burnt by Hungarians, iii. 150. Council of, decides for Victor IV., iv. 292. Council of, vii. 534.
- Paul*, St., hatred of, shown in the Clementina, i. 62.
- Paul's*, St., Council in, vi. 106. Disturbance in, vii. 877. Gifts to, viii. 156.
- Paul*, Pope, ii. 428. His adulation of Pepin, 429. Fear of the Greeks, 430. Pontificate peaceful, 432.
- Paul*, Bishop of Kinesa, negotiates peace with Cyril, i. 248.
- Paul*, Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 275, 341. His declaration in favor of image-worship, and death, 343.
- Paulicians*, v. 158. Persecutions of, under Theodora — in Bulgaria, 159.
- Paulinus* converts King Edwin, ii. 187. (Converts Northumbrians, 187. Bishop of York, 188. His flight into Kent, 190.
- Peace* of Germany, iv. 73. Irksome to the nobles, 77.
- Peada*, son of Penda, conversion of, ii. 194.
- Peasants* under Frederick II., v. 387.
- Pedro* of Arragon makes kingdom feudatory to Pope, v. 67. His marriage and journey to Rome, 68. In Albigensian war, 199. Protects Count Raymond, 206. His appeal to Pope Innocent III., 206. Slain at Muret, 208.
- Pelagian* controversy, i. 164. Origin of, in human nature, 168.
- Pelagianism*, an element of all religious systems, i. 168. Indifference to, in the East, 200.
- Pelagius* a Briton, i. 165. In Rome, Africa, and Palestine — acquitted of heresy — opposed by Augustine, and by Jerome, 166. Declared orthodox by Pope Zosimus, 180. Declaration retracted, 183.
- Pelagius* I., Pope, his previous history, i. 471. Sent by Totila to Constantinople — made Pope, 472. Accused of plotting against Vigilius — regarded with suspicion, 478. Supported by Narses — his death, 474.
- Pelagius* II., Pope, i. 476.
- Penance* at Canosa, iii. 456. Of Henry II., 420. Of St. Louis, vi. 18.
- Penda*, his victory over Edwin, ii. 169. Over Oswald, 192. Defeated and slain by Oswio, 194.
- Penitential* system, i. 550, 553. Advantages of, 554.
- Pepin* the Short, unites France, ii. 389. Elected King, 418. Teutonizes French monarchy, 416. Anointed by Pope

PETER.

- Stephen, 420. Invades Italy, 422. Second invasion of Italy, 423. His success, 427. Entitled "Patrician of Rome," 428.
- Pepin*, son of Louis the Pious, his successful rebellion, ii. 534. Submits to his father, 537. Rebels again, 540. Dies, 548.
- Pepin*, Count, in Rome, vii. 182.
- "*Perils of the last Times*," burned before Alexander IV., vi. 74.
- Persecution* by Nero and Domitian, i. 52. Under Trajan in the East, 53. By Maximin, 80. By Decius, 81. Of pilgrims, iv. 21. Of heretics in Langue-doc, vi. 32. In France, 37.
- Persia*, war with, ii. 108. Mohammedan conquest of, 161.
- Perugia*, conclave at, vi. 182, 372. Boniface IX. in, vii. 275. Tumults in, 276. Abandoned by Pope, 276.
- Peter*, St., the leading person of the Clementina, i. 62. Roman claim of descent from, 128.
- Peter's*, St., Rome, contest for, iii. 507. New cathedral, design for, viii. 126.
- Peter* the Fuller, his intrigues at Antioch, i. 317, 323. Agrees to the Henoticon, 323. Excommunicated by Pope Felix, 329.
- Peter* the Stammerer, Bishop of Alexandria, i. 322.
- Peter* the Archdeacon, remarkable death of, ii. 88.
- Peter*, Bishop of Florence, iii. 350.
- Peter* the Hermit, iv. 25. His preaching and influence, 27. In Germany, 70.
- Peter*, son of Leo, his influence over Paschal II., iv. 96. His part in treaty with Henry V., 99.
- Peter* of Blois, his account of death of Urban III., iv. 443. Efforts for King Richard's liberation, 451.
- Peter*, King of Hungary, dethroned, iii. 272.
- Peter* the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, protects Abélard, iv. 219. Refutes Peter de Brueys, v. 142.
- Peter* of Capua, legate in France, iv. 542. Declares Interdict, 544. Papal legate to Crusaders at Zara, v. 100. Recalled by Innocent III., 119, 120.
- Peter* de Castelnau, Legate to Provence, v. 168, 174. Excommunicates Count Raymond, 174. Murdered, 176. His murder ascribed to Count Raymond, 177.
- Peter*, Monk of Vaux Cernay, his history of Albigensian war, v. 126.
- Peter* of Arragon, vi. 150. Prepares for war, 151. His secrecy, 153. Arrives in Sicily, 162. His embassy to Charles of Anjou, 163. Agrees to single combat, 164. At Bordeaux, 163. His death, 171.

PETER.

- Peter Lombard*, "Sentences" of, viii. 288.
Peter's pence, iv. 800; v. 814.
Petra, conquered by Rome, ii. 112.
Petrarch, "de Vita solitaria," vi. 195. At Avignon, vii. 187. His opinion of Rienzi, 193. His expostulation to Urban V., 215. Religion of, viii. 346.
Petrobrussians, v. 142.
Peyraud, Hugh de, vi. 426.
Philagathus, a Greek — Antipope, iii. 196. Cruel treatment of, by Otho III., 197.
Philip I. of France, charges against, by Gregory VII., iii. 391. His character, 524. Excommunicated, 524.
Philip Augustus, his crusade, iv. 447. Takes part with Emperor Philip, 502. Marries Ingeburga of Denmark, 539. His aversion to her, 540. Marries Agnes of Meran, 542. His peace with England, 544. His rage at Interdict, 547. Compelled to submit, 551. Acknowledges Ingeburga, 552. Treats her with neglect — supports Prince Arthur of England, v. 15. Abandons his cause, 16. Summons John of England to do homage, 17. Makes war on John, 18. Takes Normandy, 20. Undertakes to dethrone King John, 33. Forbidden to proceed by Pope, 41. His rage, 41. Establishes college for Greeks at Paris, 117. Approves crusade against Provençal heretics, 180. His jealousy of Simon de Montfort, 204, 211. Death of, vi. 170, 171.
Philip the Fair, vi. 213. Compared with Edward I., 242. His policy, 246. Deludes Edward I., 246. His rapacity, 255. Reactions from Jews and bankers, 256. From nobles, 257. Taxes clergy, 258. Resists Pope, 265. Detains daughter of Count of Flanders, 267. Bull of Boniface VIII. against, 268. His reply, 271-273. His war with England, 275. Succeeds in Flanders, 276. Willingness for peace, 277. Treaty with Edward I., 278. Abandons Scots, 299. His quarrel with Pope, 299. Its grounds, 300. Dissatisfied with Papal arbitration, 302. Alliance with Albert of Austria, 303. Arraigus and imprisons Papal Legate, 307. His reply to Lesser Bull, 314. Burns Greater Bull, 318. Condemns the Inquisition, 329. His reply to Pope, 334. Excommunicated — holds Parliament at the Louvre, 335. His "Ordinance of Reformation," 337. Seizes Papal despatches, 340. Appeals to General Council, 345. Second excommunication of, 350. His embassy to Benedict XI. — obtains absolution, 360, 361. Persecutes memo-

PIACENZA.

- ry of Boniface VIII. — his embassy to Cardinals, 363, 364. Secret compact with Clement V., 374. Insists on condemnation of Boniface, 377. His expedients for raising money, 379, 380. His reception of Du Molay, 392. Arrests the Templars, 396. His further proceedings against them, 400. Sends message to England, 410. Seeks empire for his brother Charles, 414. Calls on Pope to condemn Templars, 417. Responsible for proceedings against Templars, 475. Contemporary testimony against, 479. Disappointed of spoils, 480. Urges proceedings against memory of Boniface VIII., 486. Refuses to prosecute before Pope, 486. Abandons prosecution, 500. Burns Du Molay, 527. His death, 532. Disasters of his last years — his poverty, 532. Conduct of his daughters-in-law, 533. His death, 534. His sons, vii. 22.
Philip de Valois, proposes crusade against Moors, vii. 114. His estrangement from John XXII., 117. Resolves on crusade, 125. Prevents Pope's reconciliation with Empire, 129. Intercedes for Louis of Bavaria, 132.
Philip the Long, King of France, vii. 22. Disturbances in his reign, 64.
Philip the Hohenstaufen, his claim to Empire, iv. 497. His negotiation with Innocent III., 501. Crowned at Mentz, 502. His address to Innocent III., 504. His adherents, 505. Innocent declares against him, 512. Holds Diet at Bamberg, 516. Acknowledged by Innocent III., 523. Murdered, 525. His ambassadors to crusaders in behalf of Alexius, v. 96.
Philip, Duke of Burgundy, viii. 92.
Philip, elected Pope by a faction, ii. 433.
Philosophy, foreign to Mohammedanism, viii. 242. Aristotelian, 245. Arabian, 251.
Philoxenus. See Xenaias.
Phocas, his usurpation, ii. 83. His character, 85.
Photius, his learning, iii. 24. Appointed Patriarch of Constantinople — his contest with Ignatius, 25. His letters to Nicolas I., 25, 28. Decree of Nicolas against, 29. Holds Council at Constantinople, 33. Deposed by Emperor Basil, 34. Condemned at Council of Constantinople, 35. His restoration, second deposition, and death, 37.
Physical science, prejudice against, viii. 135.
Piacenza, Council of, iii. 517. Great assemblage, 518. Receives charges against Henry IV. — its decrees, 519. First mention of crusade coldly received, 523.

PICCOLOMINI.

- Piccolomini*, family of, viii. 65.
Pictures of Saints, ii. 302. Argument in favor of, 303. Allegorical, vii. 162.
Piers Ploughman's Vision, viii. 372. Poetry of, 373. On wealth of clergy, 375. Against Mendicants, 376. On clergy — politics of, 377. Allegory of, 379. The Vision, 380. Its moral, 382. Probably unfinished, 384.
Pilgrimage, opinions of the Fathers upon, iv. 17. Growing tendency to, 18. Commerce of, 19. Continued under Mohammedan rule, 20. Dangers of, 21.
Pilgrims at Rome, plundered, iii. 231, 232. Persecuted by Turks, iv. 21. To Rome, vi. 235.
Pisa, the Papal city under Innocent II., iv. 174. Cathedral of — Council of, vii. 312, 313. Its proceedings, 315. Deposes rival Popes, 317. Elects Alexander V., 320. Architecture of, viii. 435.
Pisano, Nicolo, sculptor and architect, viii. 460.
Pius II. See *Æneas Sylvius*, viii. 120.
Plague at Rome, ii. 52. At Avignon, vii. 184. At Ferrara, viii. 81. At Basle, 56, 78.
Plasian, William of, vi. 307. His charges against Boniface VIII., 341. His advice to Du Molay, 428. Prosecutor of memory of Boniface VIII., 439.
Pluralities, viii. 164
Poetry, Provençal, v. 163; viii. 337. Of St. Francis, v. 264. Vernacular, 236. Early Italian, v. 331. Parisian vulgar, vi. 76. Christian Latin, viii. 301. Scriptural, 302. Historical, 304. Latin, 305. Lyric, 320. Crusading, 324. Satiric, 325. Italian, 338, 339. Romance, 356. Rise of English, 371.
Poggio Bracciolini, viii. 123.
Poitiers, Clement V. at, vi. 331, 417.
Pollentia, battle of, i. 144.
Polychronius at Constantinople, ii. 285.
Pongiluppo of Ferrara, vii. 37.
Ponsard de Gisi undertakes defence of Templars, vi. 429. Tortured, 430.
Pontianus, Pope, banished to Sardinia — martyrdom of, i. 80.
Pontificate, Roman, the centre of Latin Christianity, i. 41.
Pontigny, Cistercian monastery, iv. 360. Becket's retirement there, 361.
Poor Men of Lyons, v. 141, 151. Condemned by Lucius III., 152. Their doctrines, 153.
Popes, early, their names nearly all Greek, i. 47. Traditions about them worthless, 48. Their obscurity, real dignity, and power, 51, 52. Danger of their post, 59. Subject to Eastern Emperor, 476; ii. 261. Their policy destructive to Italy, i. 477, 478. List

PROHIBITED.

- of, from Gregory I. to Gregory II., ii. 260. Temporal power of, 339. Rapid succession of (9th century), iii. 111. Their part in Imperial elections, 154. Three rival, 232. All degraded by Henry III., 233. Gain power from Crusades, iv. 41, 464. Keep aloof from Crusades, 48. Their legates, 45. Victory over Empire, 435. Avarice of, v. 433; vii. 270. Alliance with Friars, vi. 63. Rapid succession of, 133. Favor France against England, vii. 214. Rival, 246. Their mutual distrust, 307. Deposed at Pisa, 317. Taxation by, viii. 158. Satires on, 326. Opposition to, in Germany, 390. Originators of houses, 437.
Porcario, Stephen, viii. 114. His conspiracy and death, 116.
Porto, Cardinal of, his speech to Consistory, vi. 324.
Portugal, relations of to Papacy, v. 61.
Portus, its situation and bishopric, i. 74. "Possessioniers," vii. 401.
Poyet, Bernard de, Cardinal, reputed son of John XXII., legate to Lombardy, vii. 72. At Bologna, 115.
Præmunire, Statute of, vii. 354, 331.
Pragmatic Sanction, vi. 40, 119; viii. 34, 174.
Prague, Rlenzi at, vii. 186. University of, 440. Articles of, 546.
Prætas the heresiarch, i. 70.
"Preachers" founded by St. Dominic, v. 246.
Preaching, disuse of, v. 230. Was the strength of heresies, 234.
Prebendaries, viii. 153.
Predestination, doctrine of, opposed to hierarchy, iv. 183.
Preferment, Papal right of, vii. 516.
Presence, Real, Erigena's definition of, iii. 263.
Priesthood, of Teutons, i. 363. Power of, viii. 180. Its loss of power, 496. Its claims, 501.
Priests, haughtiness of, viii. 423.
Primogeniture, ii. 523.
Printing, viii. 494.
Priscillian, put to death by Maximus, i. 276.
Priscillianites in Spain, i. 278.
Procession of Holy Ghost, viii. 39, 46, 135.
Procida, John of, vi. 146. His intrigues, 152.
Proclus preaches against Nestorius, i. 209. Bishop of Constantinople, 250.
Procopius, vii. 545, 547. His victories, 551. His death, 563.
Procurations, v. 433.
Progress of intellect, viii. 439.
Prohibited degrees of marriage — extended to spiritual relationship, i. 493

PROPHECIES.

- Prophecies*, Franciscan, vii. 28, 83.
Prophetesses, Teutonic, i. 363.
Property, law of, as affecting the church, i. 507, 535.
Prosper, a partisan of Augustine, i. 191. His poem, 192.
Proterius, murder of, i. 317.
Provencal poetry, v. 163; viii. 335. Clergy, v. 164. Language, 236.
Provence, subject to kings of Naples, vii. 16.
Provisions, vii. 516.
Prorisors, statute of, vii. 268, 351. Re-enacted, 354.
Prudentius, viii. 308.
Prussia, paganism in, vi. 537. Subject to Teutonic knights, 538.
Ptolemais, Frederick II. at, v. 349.
"Publicans," doctrines of, v. 149. Burnt as heretics, 149.
Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II., i. 243. Ruins Nestorius, 244. Empress — marries Marcian, 290. Her death, 295.
Purgatory. growth of belief in, viii. 224. Visions and legends of, 227.
Pyrrhus, Bishop of Constantinople, flies to Africa, ii. 273. At Rome — his monothelitism, 274. Anathematized by Pope Theodorus, 275.

Q.

- Questions*. See *Controversies*.
Quinisextan Council, ii. 289.
Quod-vult-Deus, Bishop of Carthage, banished to Italy by Genseric, i. 269.

R.

- Races of Europe*, viii. 370.
Rachias, a Lombard king, attacks Perugia, ii. 409. Becomes monk, 410. Reappears, 428.
Rainieri, Bishop, his war against Doleinites, vii. 47.
Rainer, Papal Legate in Spain, v. 61, 66.
Randolph de Broc, an enemy of Becket, iv. 361, 406, 409.
Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, iii. 171, 172.
Rationalism of Erigena, iv. 186.
Ratisbon, Diet at, iv. 83; vii. 84.
Ravenna, monument of Theodoric at, i. 443. Exarchs of, their weakness, ii. 371. Tumults in — taken by Liutprand, 376. Retaken, 377. Parties in, 378. Ceded to Roman Church by Rudolph of Hapsburg, vi. 133. Decline of, vii. 172. Churches of, 420.
Raymond, Count of Toulouse, v. 171.

RHEIMS.

- His difficult position, 173. Excommunicated, 174. Charged with murder of Papal legate, 176. Excommunicated by Pope, 179. His submission and penance, 183. Compelled to join crusade, 184. Continued persecution of, 192. His journey to Rome, 193. New demands upon, 197. Takes up arms, 200. His contest in Toulouse with Bishop, 201. Defeated at Muret, 206. His submission — puts to death his brother, 209. Withdraws to England, 211. Deposed by Lateran Council, 212. Appears before the Pope, 213. Recovers Toulouse, 220. His death — his body refused burial, 223.
Raymond VII. (the younger) of Toulouse, flies to England, v. 211. At Rome, 213. Under protection of Innocent III., 218. His war with De Montfort, 218. Treaty with St. Louis, 223. Penance, 224. Rises against Louis IX., vi. 36. Forced to submit, 36.
Raymond de Pennafort, v. 398.
Realists and Nominalists, iv. 190, 191.
Reason, limits of, viii. 276.
Reared, Catholic King of Spain, ii. 66.
"Reformation, Ordinance of," vi. 337.
Reformation, causes of, viii. 182. Demand for, 407.
Reforms of Benedict XII., vii. 133.
"Refutation of all Heresies," Hippolytus its probable author, i. 75.
Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, iv. 363. His death, 378.
Relics, ii. 96. Tales of their efficacy, 97. Supply of, from Palestine, iv. 19. Plunder of, at Constantinople, v. 109. Veneration of St. Louis for, vi. 21. Brought into hall of council at Basle, viii. 64. Veneration for, 217. Wars respecting, 219.
Religion, popular, viii. 186. Various elements of, 499.
Religious wars in Gaul, i. 384. Origin of, ii. 169. Established by Crusades, iv. 49. Their subsequent prevalence, 53.
Remi, St., church of, consecrated, iii. 250. Sanctity of, viii. 213.
Remigius, baptizes Clovis, i. 381. His remains removed, iii. 250.
"Renardus Vulpes," viii. 307.
Republic in Rome, iv. 239, 245. Its end, 265, 266. Under Rienzi, vii. 167.
Republics, Italian, extinct, viii. 487.
Reservations, vii. 516.
Reserves, Papal, vii. 120.
Revival of letters, viii. 488, 490.
Revolution in Rome, vii. 162. Omens of, viii. 489, 490.
Rhaetagus invades Italy, i. 145. His defeat and death, 145, 146.
Rheims, wealth and importance of, i. 402.

RHENI.

- Rheims*, Council of, deposes Arnulf, iii. 209. Council of, 251. Its decrees, 255. Council of, iv. 133, 169.
- Rhythms*, the, viii. 310.
- Richard*, Count of Ancona, his cruel death, iv. 456.
- Richard Cœur de Lion*, iv. 447. His imprisonment, 451. Protects Otho, 498. Makes peace with France, 544. His alliance with Innocent III., v. 14. His death, 14.
- Richard II.*, his accession, vii. 379.
- Richard of Cornwall* elected Emperor, vi. 49. His death, 126.
- Rienzi*, at Avignon, vii. 138, 155. His story of his birth, 151. His early history, 154. His letter to Rome, 156. His poverty, 157. Complains of state of Rome, 158. His dissimulation, 159. His allegorical pictures, 160. Revolutionizes Rome, 162. Laws of, 163. Describes his success, 165. His justice, 166. Power, 167. Titles, 169. Respect for the Church, 170. The height of his power, 171. His proclamation, 172; and coronation, 173. Prophecy of his fall, 173. His ostentation, 174. Arrests the nobles—restores them, 176, 177. His victory over Colonnas, 179. His despondency, 180. Denounced by Pope, 181. His abdication, 182. Flight, 183; and retreat among the Fraticelli, 184. Goes to Prague, 186. His interviews with Charles I., 187. Imprisoned—letter of, 188. Letter to Archbishop of Prague, 190. Doubtful motives, 192. Sent prisoner to Avignon—Petrarch's opinion of, 194. His trial and imprisonment, 195. Sent to Rome, 206. Made Senator, 206. His capricious rule, 206; and murder, 207.
- Ripon*, church at, ii. 209.
- Ripuarian law*, i. 517.
- Ritus*, v. 231.
- "*Robber Synod.*" See *Ephesus*.
- Robert*, King of France, his submission to the Church, iii. 390.
- Robert of France*, Pope Gregory offers Imperial crown to, v. 436.
- Robert*, King of Naples, vi. 518. Vicar of Italy, vii. 72. Besieges Ostia, 106.
- Rodolf the Norman*, iii. 226.
- Rodolph of Hapsburg* elected Emperor, vi. 127. His gifts to Roman church, 138.
- Roger*, King of Sicily, upholds Anacletus II., iv. 172. His wars with Innocent II., 178.
- Roger*, Archbishop of York, an enemy of Becket, iv. 318. Made Papal Legate, 341. At Northampton, 348. Ambassador to Louis VII., 354. To Pope Alexander, 357. Crowns Prince Henry, 400. Suspended by Pope, 405. Justifies murder of Becket, 417.

ROMANS.

- Roland*, a priest, delivers to Pope Gregory VII. Henry IV.'s letter, iv. 434.
- Romagna*, tranquillity of, under Nicolas V., viii. 107.
- Roman Bishop*, obscurity of, i. 50, 93. Absence of from Councils, 99, 101. Greatness after restoration of Rome, 162. Imperial character of, 163. Indifferent to destruction of Western Empire, 314.
- Roman buildings* restored by Theodoric, i. 410.
- Roman Christians*, their wealth and bounty, i. 53.
- Roman church*, its importance, i. 57. The centre of Christendom, and of all controversies, 58, 59. Centre of heresies, 59. Discord in, 68. Composition of, 74. Intercourse with Carthage, 81. Subsequent dispute, 88. Supremacy of, acknowledged by Cyprian, 89. Head of Western churches, 97. Free from speculative discord, 98. Supports Athanasius, 100. In decline of Empire, 126. Veneration for, 128. Growth of its supremacy, 129. Silent aggression of, 130. Appeals to, 135, 136. Appealed to on Pelagian question, 177. Wherein its power consisted, 179. Strengthened by Eastern contentions, 219. Its supremacy over Illyricum, 279. Causes of its strength, 297. Remains—sole government of Rome, 307. Power of, in absence of Emperor, 471. Organization of, ii. 56. Its estates, 57. Value of its property, 59. Influence of in England, 200. Denounced by Franciscan prophets, vii. 33, 36, 43. See *Papacy*.
- Roman conquest of Petra*, ii. 112.
- Roman demagogues*, viii. 114.
- Roman dominion of Gaul*, viii. 350.
- Roman Empire*, division of, i. 96. State of at accession of Leo the Great, 256.
- Roman law* affected by Christianity, i. 479. Required consolidation, 484. Attempts to organize, 485. Recognizes slavery, 491.
- Roman life*, curious picture of, i. 76.
- Roman morals*, their corrupt state—Teutonic influence on, i. 390.
- Roman people*, character of, vii. 174.
- Roman power* revives under Justinian, i. 449.
- Roman supremacy*, question of, i. 324.
- Roman territory*, depredations of nobles in, iii. 86.
- Romance of the Rose*, vi. 75.
- Romance poetry*, viii. 357. Languages, 361.
- Romanesque architecture*, viii. 433. Transalpine, 435.
- Romans* welcome Belisarius, i. 461. Defeats of by Mohammedans, ii. 154.

ROMANUS.

Faithful to Gregory VII., iii. 487. Venality of, 491. Surrender, 498. Rise against Normans, 494. Rise against Germans, iv. 104. Their war with Henry V., 106. Quarrel with Paschal II., 121. Rise against Innocent II., 240. Invite Emperor Conrad, 240. Defend Rome against Lucius II., 243. Embassy to Frederick Barbarossa, 271. Raise tumult — suppressed by Frederick Barbarossa, 278. Defeated by troops of Frederick, 429. Their rebellion and insolence, 439. Procure destruction of Tusculum, 449. Rise against Otho IV., 428. Against Gregory IX., v. 345. Fickleness of — their enmity to Viterbo, 404. Rebel against Gregory IX., 406. Submit, 407. Demand a Roman Pope, vii. 280.

Romanus, governor of Boara, his treachery and apostasy, ii. 156.

Rome, the church in, was originally Greek, i. 54. Influence of the name of, 133. Siege of by Alaric, 149. Capitulates, 150. Admits Attalus, 152. Third siege of, and capture, 153. Sack of, 154. Mitigated by Christianity, 155, 157. Remains Christian — restoration of, 161. Destruction of was partial — capture of tended to Papal greatness, 161, 162. Rumored conspiracies in, 434. Second capture by Goths, 472. Ecclesiastical supremacy of, 544. Appeals to, 546. Plague and famine at, ii. 52. State of, at Gregory's accession, 78. Ingratitude of to Gregory, 87. Councils at, condemn Iconoclasm, ii. 881, 883. Anarchy and cruelties in, 433. Unsettled state of, iii. 153. Attempted republicanism in, 183-186. Papal, turbulence of, ii. 511, 518. Threatened by Saracens, iii. 84. Siege of, by Henry IV., 487. Surrendered, 492. Surprised and burnt by Normans, 494. Republic in, iv. 239, 245. Its end, 265. Placed under interdict, 265. Venality of, 428. Pestilence at, 430. State of at accession of Innocent III. — submission of, 473. Feuds in, 474. War with Viterbo, 476. Anarchy in, 478. Rapacity of, v. 85. Takes part of Conradin, vi. 111. Dante on Imperial destiny of, 521. Deserted by Pope, vii. 16, 150. Calls on John XXII. to return, 98. Admits Louis of Bavaria, 98. Rienzi's revolution in, 162. Submits to Pope, 207. Its increasing estrangement, 213. Return of Pope to, 217. Tumultuous conclave at, 228. Proceedings in, 231, 232. Disturbances in, 276, 293. Council of (John XXIII.) — incident at, 335. Pillaged by Neapolitans, 338. Miserable condition of (Martin V.), 528. Rises against Euge-

SARACENS.

nus IV., 564. Centre of art and letters, viii. 125. Architecture of, 412. Churches of, 416. Christian architecture unknown in, 486.

Roscelin, Nominalistic doctrines of, iv. 191.

Rose, the Golden, vii. 464.

Rotharis, i. 517.

Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, iii. 65. Appeals against Hincmar, 65.

Rudolf III. of Burgundy, iii. 227.

Rudolph of Swabia, rival of Henry IV., iii. 466. Elected — crowned at Mentz, 468. Low state of his affairs, 477. Acknowledged king by Pope, 481. His death, 484.

Rule of St. Francis, v. 272.

Russian prelates at Florence, viii. 39.

Rustand, legate in England, vi. 43.

S.

Saaz, battle of, vii. 546.

Sabellius, i. 73.

Sabinianus, Pope, accuses Gregory I. of waste, ii. 262; and of Iconoclasm, 263. His death, 264.

Sacerdotal hierarchy, viii. 195.

Sagarelli, Gerard, of Parma, his imitation of the Apostles, vii. 38. His extravagances, 39. Burnt — strange account of, 40, 41.

Saints, their protecting power, ii. 96. Belief in, viii. 204. Deification of, 205. Calendar of, 209; of the East and West, 210. General and local, 212. National, 213. Festivals of — legends of, 215. Lives of, versified, 306. Buildings in honor of, 428.

Sausset, Papal legate in France, character of, vi. 305. Arraigned, 308. Imprisoned, 310.

Saladin, iv. 444.

Salerno betrays Empress Constantia, iv. 450. Punished by Henry VI., 454.

Salic law, i. 519; vii. 22.

Salrian on chastity of the Teutons, i. 392.

Sancho, King of Navarre, v. 66.

Sanction, Pragmatic. *See* Pragmatic Sanction.

Sta. Sophia, church of, viii. 418.

Saracen ladies in court of Frederick II., v. 330.

Saracens defeated by Leo the Armenian, ii. 856. Wars of with Theophilus, 866. Invade Italy, iii. 18. Threaten Rome, 84. Dread of, 85. Their stronghold on the Garigliano, 161. Driven out by Pope John X., 103. In South Italy, 276. Chivalry of, iv. 60. In Sicily, 489. At Capua, v. 374. In Manfred's service, vi. 91.

SARDIGNA.

Sardica, Council of, i. 101. Establishes appeals to Rome, 139.
Sardinia recovered from Saracens, iii. 226. Affairs of, v. 448.
Sarzana, Thomas of. See Nicolas V.
Satiric poetry, monkish, viii. 324. Earnestness of, 326.
Sautree, William, Wycliffite martyr, vii. 412.
Sarona, meeting of rival Popes appointed at, vii. 296. Delays regarding, 301.
Saxon wars of Charlemagne, ii. 472, 475. Their bloody character, 476. Were religious wars, 480. Prisoners, escape of, iii. 443.
Saxons, severe laws of against unchastity, i. 534. Their country, ii. 473. Their enmity to the Franks, 474. Bad reception of missionaries, 475. Resistance to Charlemagne, 478. Compulsory conversion, 480. Revolt against Henry IV., iii. 404. Their declaration, 406. Defeated at Hohenburg, 406. Their sacrilege at Hartsburg, 409. Their treaty with Henry V., iv. 142.
Šbinko, Archbishop of Prague, resists Huss, vii. 439. Burns Wycliffe's books, 441.
Schaffhausen, Pope John XXIII. at, iv. 472.
Schism of forty years, i. 331. Its close, 431.
Schism, Papal, iii. 323; iv. 291; vii. 244. Terminated, iv. 436. Persecutions during, vii. 264. Attempts to terminate, 278, 279. Sentence of Council of Pisa on, 317. Indifference to, viii. 61.
Schlick, Gaspar, viii. 83.
Scholasticism, viii. 234. Latin, 235; and Mysticism, 240. Great era of, 253. Unprofitableness, 257. Tendency to Pantheism, 279. Its duration, 296.
Schoolmen, vi. 76; viii. 236. Five great, 254. All Mendicants, 255. Their titles, 258.
Schools at Athens suppressed by Justinian, i. 453. Monastery, iv. 189. English, vii. 355.
Scolastica, St., sister of Benedict, ii. 25. Her death, 31.
Scotists and Thomists, viii. 280.
Scotland, resists Edward I., vi. 277. Appeals to Pope, 279. Claimed as fief by Pope, 281. Claims of England upon, 297. Arrest of Templars in, 466; their examination, 468. Aeneas Sylvius's account of, viii. 69.
Scots, reply to claims of Edward I., vi. 297. Abandoned by Pope and French King, 299.
Scott, Michael, viii. 250

SICILY.

Scotti, their feuds at Rome, iv. 473, 478.
Scottish clergy, their dispute with Romans, ii. 196.
Scotus, John. See Duns Scotus.
Sculpture, advance of under Nicolas V., viii. 129. Christian, 452. Rare in the East, 454. Proscribed in Greek Church, 455. Christian, in the West, 456. Architectural, 457. Rudeness of, 458. Monumental, 460. In wood, 471.
Sectarianism, time of Innocent III., v. 134. Its principle of union, 135.
Sects in early Christendom, iii. 267.
Secular clergy, strife of with monks, iii. 335; 386. Their resistance to Dunstan, 385. (France), dispute with friars, vi. 78.
Seljukians. See Turks.
Semi-Pelagian controversy, conducted with moderation, i. 193.
Semi-Pelagianism, i. 185. Revives in Gaul under Cassianus, 189. Doctrines of, 193.
Senatorship of Rome, vi. 141.
Sens, Council of, iv. 218.
"Sentences" of Peter Lombard, viii. 238.
Serena, widow of Stilicho, put to death, i. 148.
Serfdom, v. 338.
Sergius, Bishop of Constantinople, starts the question of Monothelitism, ii. 267. Pope, 287. Rejects Quinisextan Council, 288. His death, 299.
Sergius II., Pope, iii. 16.
Sergius III., takes refuge in Tuscany, iii. 155. Deposes Christopher and becomes Pope, 157. Obscurity of his Papacy—alleged vices, 158.
Sergius IV., Pope, iii. 222.
Sergius, Duke of Naples, his league with Saracens, iii. 88. Betrayed—his miserable death, 89.
Serpent, symbol of Satan, viii. 201.
Services, Greek and Latin, difference of, viii. 422.
Severinus, Pope, condemns Monothelitism, ii. 71.
Severus, his riots in Constantinople, i. 338. Made Bishop of Antioch, 340. Degraded, 430.
Sewal, Archbishop of York, vi. 44.
Sforza, Ludovico, vii. 526.
Sforza, Francis, viii. 104. Duke of Milan, 105.
Shepherds, French insurgents. See Pastoureaux.
"Sic et Non" of Abélard, iv. 224.
Sicilian exiles, vi. 149. Vespers, 155.
Sicilians excluded from Jubilee, vi. 276.
Sicily, Oriental manners in, v. 230. Discontent of against French, vi. 146. Insurrection in, 156. Crusade proclaimed against, 159. Affairs of (time

SIEGFRIED.

- of Boniface VIII.), 216. Resolute independence of, 218. War of, 219. Italian language in, viii. 340. Kingdom of, *see* Naples.
- Siegfried*, Archbishop of Mentz, iii. 411. Calls synod at Erfurt, 413. His flight, 414. Calls synod at Mentz—intimidated, 419.
- Siegfried*, Papal Archbishop of Mentz, iv. 518. Publishes excommunication of Otho IV., 530. 531.
- Sienna*, viii. 109.
- Sienna*, Council at, vii. 535. *Aeneas Silvius*, Bishop of, viii. 109.
- Sigismund*, Emperor, character of, vii. 339. Interview with John XXIII., 343. Invites Huss to Constance, 443. Arrives at Constance, 448. His poverty, 450. Abandons Huss, 455. Excuses for, 456. Detains Pope, 465. Interview with Pope, 467. His embarrassment in the matter of Huss, 484. His declaration against Huss, 491. His apology to Bohemians, 500. His contest with Cardinals, 512. Takes leave of Council of Constance, 522. Succeeds to Bohemian crown, 544. Insurrection and war against, 545. Negotiates with Bohemians, 549. His progress through Italy, 557. At Sienna, 558. His coronation, 561. At Council of Basle, 562. Decline of his power, 565. His death, viii. 33, 34.
- Silverius*, Pope, son of Hormisdas, i. 461. Degraded by Theodora—appeals to Justinian, 463. Returns to Rome—his banishment and death, 464.
- Silvester*, Pope, i. 94. Donation of Constantine to, 95.
- Silvester II.* *See* Gerbert.
- Simeon Stylites* applied to by Theodosius, i. 247. His sanctity, 318. Death and funeral at Antioch, 319.
- Simon de Montfort* takes the Cross, v. 86. At Zara, 96. Leaves the army, 102. Leads Crusade against heretics, 187. Invested with conquered lands, 190. His power, 200. His character, 200. Takes Lavour, 203. His sovereignty, 205. Gains victory at Muret, 208. Chosen King of Languedoc—reaction against—war with young Raymond, 218. Suppresses risings in Toulouse, 219. Besieges Toulouse, 220. Is slain, 221.
- Simon de Montfort*, Earl of Leicester, excommunicated, vi. 88. His death—a popular saint, 101, 102.
- Simon of Tournay*, viii. 247.
- Simony*, measures against, iii. 237. Prevalence of, 244. Caused by wealth and power of Church, 370. Tends to impoverish the Church, 373. Papal, vii. 270.

STEPHEN.

- Simplicius*, Pope at extinction of Roman Empire, i. 314. Remonstrates against Acacius, 326. Death of, 327.
- Siricius*, Pope, issues the first Decretal, i. 119.
- Sixtus*, Pope, i. 250.
- Slavery* recognized by Justinian, i. 491. Regulations concerning—previous mitigations of, 493. Under barbaric laws, 527. Gradually changed to serfdom, 532.
- Slaves*, their life and person protected, i. 493. Marriages of, 494. Trade in was legal, 495. Marriages of under barbaric law, 528. Their lives unprotected, 530. Runaway—emancipation of, 532.
- Slavian* language used in churches, iii. 124.
- Soissons*, election of Pepin at, ii. 413. Council of, condemns Abélard, iv. 205. Council of, 553.
- Sophronius*, Bishop of Jerusalem, capitulates to Mohammedans, ii. 158. Resists Monothelitism, 270.
- Spain*, unsettled state of in 5th century, i. 276. Monasticism in, ii. 21. Converted from Arianism, 64, 65. And France, birthplace of chivalry, iv. 55. Innocent III.'s measures in, v. 60. Affairs of (time of Clement IV.), vi. 106. Acquittal of Templars in, 471. Church in, viii. 175.
- Spanish* Bishops among the Lapsi, i. 90.
- Spectacles* at Rome under Theodoric, i. 411.
- Spencer*, Bishop of Norwich, his crusade in Flanders, vii. 397.
- Spires*, Diet at, vi. 512; vii. 87.
- Spiritualists*, vii. 27. Prophecies of, 29, 33. Avow the "Eternal Gospel," 81. Followers of Celestine V., 82. Persecuted by John XXII., 55. For Emperor against Pope, 82.
- Squino di Florian* professes to tell secrets of Templars, vi. 336. His monstrous charges, 397.
- "*Stabat Mater*," viii. 309.
- States General*. *See* Parliament, French.
- Statues* in churches, viii. 453. Destroyed by Crusaders, 456.
- Statutes* of Toulouse, v. 225.
- Stedinger*, heresy of, v. 401.
- Stephania*, widow of Crescentius, poisons Otho III., iii. 218.
- Stephen*, Pope, his dispute with Cyprian—with Firmilian, i. 88. His lenity to Spanish Bishops, 90.
- Stephen II.*, Pope, treats with Astolph, ii. 417. Applies for aid to Constantinople—sets out for France, 418. Is met by Prince Charles, 419. Obtains promise of aid against Lombards, 420. Anoints Pepin and his sons, 420. At

STEPHEN.

- tacked in Rome by Astolph, 422. His letters to Pepin, 423, 424.
- Stephen III.*, Pope, cruelties at his election, ii. 433. Factions in his Popedom, 434. Supported by Lombards, 435. Remonstrates against Charlemagne's marriage, 439.
- Stephen IV.*, Pope, flies from Rome, ii. 518. Crowns Louis the Pious at Rheims, 519.
- Stephen V.*, Pope, iii. 105.
- Stephen VI.*, Pope, insults remains of Formosus, iii. 110. Strangled in prison, 111.
- Stephen IX.* (Frederick of Lorraine), iii. 279. Flies from Henry III., 286. Restored by Pope Victor II. — Abbot of Monte Casino, 289. Pope, his high language at Constantinople, 291. Denounces Patriarch, 292. His plans against Normans, 293. His death, 294.
- Stephen*, King, war of with Matilda, iv. 305.
- Stephen*, St., King of Hungary, iii. 271.
- Stephen*, the monk, denounces Iconoclasm, ii. 834. Imprisoned and murdered, 834.
- Stigand*, Saxon Archbishop, deposed by William the Conqueror, iv. 301.
- "*Stigmata*" of St. Francis, v. 268.
- Stilicho* defeats Alaric, i. 144; and Rhadagalsus, 145. His disgrace and death, 146. His memory blackened, 147. Consequences of his death, 148.
- Strasburg*, religious contests in, viii. 898. Resistance to Pope in, 408.
- Stratford*, Archbishop of Canterbury, vii. 852.
- Straw*, Jack, vii. 387, 388.
- Sturmi*, a follower of St. Boniface, journey of, ii. 257. Founds monastery at Fulda, 258.
- Subiaco*, monasteries of, ii. 27.
- Subsidies* of clergy, vi. 254.
- Subsidies* to Mendicants, viii. 157.
- Succession*, principles of, unsettled, ii. 410.
- Sudbury*, Simon de, Archbishop, beheaded by insurgents, vii. 386.
- Suffrage*, right of at Councils, vii. 453.
- Suger*, of St. Denys, minister of French Kings, iv. 256. His early life, 257. Regent of France — his death, 259.
- "*Sum of Theology*," viii. 267.
- Supino*, Reginald di, attacks Pope Boniface VIII. at Anagni, vi. 352. Collects witnesses, 485.
- Supremacy* of Emperor over Church, i. 482. Of barbarian kings, 483. Spiritual and Feudal, vi. 313, 323. Of Roman Church, see Roman Church.
- Sweden*, Christianity in, iii. 139. Partial conversion of, 141.
- Symbolism* of Gothic architecture, viii. 447.

TEMPLARS.

- Symmachus*, heathen orator, i. 198.
- Symmachus*, son of the above, Prefect of Rome, i. 198.
- Symmachus*, Pope, strife at his election, i. 350, 416. His invective against Emperor Anastasius, 351. Confirmed by Theodoric, 418. Accusations against, 419. Acquitted, 421. Death of, 423.
- Symmachus*, chief of the Senate, i. 413. Put to death by Theodoric, 444.
- Syria* becomes Mohammedan, ii. 153. Easy conquest of, 153.
- Syrian Bishops*, at Ephesus, i. 237. Condemn proceedings of Cyril and the majority, 238. At Chalcedon, 243. Synods of, 247. Their treaty with Cyril, 248. Resist John of Antioch, 250.
- Syropulus*, viii. 23.
- T.
- Taass*, battle of, vii. 549.
- Tabor*, in Bohemia, viii. 105.
- "*Taborites*," vii. 543, 547; viii. 110.
- Tacitus* compared with Dante, viii. 843.
- Tagliacozzo*, battle of, vi. 114.
- Talleyrand*, Cardinal, vii. 200.
- Tanchelin*, of Antwerp, v. 147.
- Tancred*, of Sicily, his war with Henry VI., iv. 450. Releases Empress Constantia, 451. Death of, 453.
- Tarasius*, Bishop of Constantinople, ii. 844. His designs in favor of image-worship, 846.
- Tarsus*, Synod of, i. 247.
- Tassilo*, his meditated revolt, ii. 452. Imprisoned in a monastery, 504.
- Tauler*, John, viii. 397. His preaching, 400. German writings, 402. Death, 404. Sermons, 405.
- Taxation* of clergy, v. 819.
- Templars*, abuse their privileges, v. 75. Oppose Frederick II. in Palestine, 350. Origin and history of, vi. 334. Their privileges and immunities, 335, 336. Their independence and rivalry with Knights of St. John, 337. Their vices, 338, 339. Retain power after loss of Palestine, 339. Wealth of, 394. Accusations against, 397. (In France) monstrous charges against, 397. Sudden arrest of, 398. Trial by torture, 402. Confessions, 404. Questions put to, 406. Arrest of in England, 412. In Naples, 412. Jealousy of, 415. Examined by Pope Clement V., 419. Cited before Commissioners at Paris, 423. Brought from the provinces, 423. Asked if they will defend the Order — their replies, 423, 424. Proceedings of court against, 425, 442. Treated as relapsed heretics, 445. Many burned to

TEMPLE.

death, 448. Burned in the provinces, 448. Confessions, 450. Result of confessions, 451. Arrest of in England and Scotland, 456. Examination in England, 456. Nothing proved against the Order, 457. Witnesses against, 457. Strange evidence, 459-464. Confessing witnesses, 465. Sentences upon in England—examination of in Scotland and Ireland, 468. In Italy, 469. In Spain, 471. In Germany, their protest and acquittal, 472. Difficulty of question of their guilt, 473. Evidence against worthless, 475. Charges against improbable, 477. Were sacrificed for their wealth, 479. Their lands given to Hospitallers, 480. The Order abolished, 481. Abolition confirmed at Council of Vienne, 508. Commission on great dignitaries of, 525.

Temple at Paris, vi. 383.

Tenants of Church lands, viii. 154.

Tenhs, levied by Gregory XI., vii. 201.

Termes, capture of, v. 198.

Tertiaries, Dominican, v. 250. Franciscan, 286.

Tertullian, the first great Christian writer in Latin, i. 57. Adopts Montanism, 70.

Teutonic character, i. 356. Was congenial to Christianity, 357.

Teutonic Christianity, i. 28. Asserts individual responsibility, 29. Tendencies of, viii. 508. Its future, 505.

Teutonic Empire. See *Empire*.

Teutonic languages, viii. 380. Religious terms derived from, 331.

Teutonic nations, their religion, i. 357. Their human sacrifices, 380. Which were common to all the tribes, 381. Animal sacrifices, 381.

Teutonic order, vi. 535. Origin of, 535. Its crusades in North of Germany, 536. Its sovereignty, 533.

Teutonic painting, viii. 485.

Teutonic rulers of Gaul, viii. 351.

Teutonism, improves Roman morals, i. 389. Exceptions to this, 394. Disappears in France, viii. 352. Opposed to Roman unity, 389. In Germany, 391. Its independence, 501. Subjective, 502.

Teutons, rapid conversion of, i. 355. Their sacred groves, 332. Belief in a future state, their priests, 382. Prophetesses, 383. Encounter Christianity, 384. Respect Roman civilization and the clergy, 386. Converted by captives, 389. Blend their previous notions with Christianity, 370. Their successive conversion—Arianism, 371. Effects of their conversion, 389. Their continence, 391, 392. Their ferocity and licentiousness in Gaul, 394. Become corrupted by

THEODOSIUS.

success, 395. Make Christianity barbarous, 398. Christianized from Rome, ii. 280.

Thaddæus of Suessa, Emperor's envoy at Lyons, v. 474. His speech, 476. Courageous defence of Frederick II., 477. Taken and slain before Parina, 497.

Thegan, historian of Louis the Pious, denounces the low-born clergy, ii. 538.

Theobald, Archbishop, iv. 305. Patron of young Becket, 313. Supports Henry II., 315. Dies, 321.

Theocracy of Gregory VII., iii. 499.

Theodelinda, Queen of Lombards, ii. 80.

Theodisc, adviser of Innocent III., v. 194.

Theodora, Empress, her profligacy—influence of, i. 451. Interferes in religion, 452. Supports Anthimus, 462. Death of, 467.

Theodora, Empress of Theophilus, ii. 362. Her secret image-worship, 367. Empress, 368.

Theodora (of Rome), her vices, influence in disposal of Papacy, iii. 153. Appoints John X., 160.

Theodore Lascaris, v. 118.

Theodorie, his war with Odoacer, i. 403. King of Italy, 404. Endeavors to unite races—his Roman ministers, 406. Division of lands, 407. Encourages agriculture, 408. Peace and security of his reign, 409. His public works, 410. Liberality, 411. Exhibits spectacles, 411, 418. His toleration, 412. Impartiality—treats Catholic clergy with respect, 413. His gifts to the Church, 414. Decides contested Papal election, 417. His visit to Rome, 418. Review of his situation, 432. Extent of his power, 432. Conspiracies against—protects Jews, 434, 435. Disarms Roman population—state of his family—danger of his kingdom, 436. Correspondence with Emperor Justin, 439. Urges toleration of Arians—sends Pope John ambassador to Constantinople, 440. Imprisons him on his return, 442. Puts to death Boethius and Symmachus—the latter years of his reign, 444. Appoints Felix Pope, 446. His death, 447. Tales of his remorse and fate after death—his tomb at Ravenna, 447. His laws Roman, 515.

Theodorus, Pope, anathematizes Pyrrhus, ii. 274, 275.

Theodorus, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 212. Supersedes Wilfrid, 213. His remorse and death, 219. Founds a Greek school at Canterbury, 224.

Theodosius II., i. 206. Favors Nestorius—rebukes Cyril, 225. Summons Council at Ephesus, 226. His rescripts, 241.

THEODOTUS.

Summons Council at Chalcedon, 242.
 Invokes aid of St. Simeon Stylites, 247.
 Death of, 290.
Theodotus, marries and puts to death Amalasuntha, i. 456. His embassy to Constantinople, 459. His threats, 459.
Theology and Metaphysics, iv. 196.
Theology, monastic, viii. 235. And philosophy, 237, 287. Popular, 499.
Theophilus, son of Michael, his marriage, ii. 360. Character, 361. Magnificence, 362. Persecutes image-worshippers, 363. Wars with the Saracens, 338.
Theotigand, Archbishop of Trèves, iii. 46. Accompanies Gunther of Cologne in exile, 48.
Theutberga, Queen of Lothair II., divorced, iii. 46. Reinstated by Papal legate, 53. Prays for dissolution of marriage, 55, 68.
Thierry, King of Burgundy, his vices, ii. 241. Banishes St. Columban, 243.
Thomas, Christian governor of Damascus, defeat of, ii. 156, 157.
Thomists and Scotists, viii. 230.
Thorpe, William, vii. 416.
Thuringia, visited by St. Boniface, ii. 250.
Timothæus Allurus, i. 315. Rules Emperor Basiliscus, 321.
Timothæus, Bishop of Constantinople, i. 339.
Tithes granted by Charlemagne, ii. 489. Original institution of, viii. 143.
Titles, ecclesiastical, were Latin, viii. 369.
Tivoli, war of with Rome—spared by Innocent II., iv. 240.
Toledo, council of, ii. 64.
Torture continued under Justinian, i. 511. Applied to Templars, vi. 402.
Tonsure, question of in England, ii. 197.
Totila takes Rome, i. 472. Visits St. Benedict, ii. 33.
Toto seizes Papacy, ii. 432.
Toulouse, Henry II.'s war in, iv. 318. Counts of, v. 162. Bishopric of, 170. Count Raymond of, 171. Supports Count Raymond, 200. Civil war in, 201. Surrendered to Simon de Montfort, 209. Rises against De Montfort—betrayed by Bishop, 219. Admits Count Raymond—siege of, 220. Statutes of, 225. Inquisition of, vi. 32.
Tours, wealth and importance of, i. 402. Battle of, ii. 335. Council of, iv. 327.
Tracy, William de, iv. 412.
Trajan, persecution by, i. 53.
Transalpine architecture, viii. 410. Painting, 434.
Translations from the Greek, viii. 123, 124.
Transubstantiation, term first used, iii. 260. Question of, renewed by Beren-

VENICE.

gar, 474. Its importance to sacerdotal power, 476. Wycliffe's opinions on, vii. 394. Huss questioned upon, 437.
Trial by battle, i. 540.
Tribonian, a reputed atheist, i. 490, 491.
Tribur, diet at, iii. 446. Its declaration against Henry IV., 447.
Tribute, English, to Rome, discussion on, vii. 363.
Trinitarian controversy, i. 98.
Trinity, Abélard's treatise on, iv. 205.
Troubadours, v. 163. Priestly, viii. 336.
Troucrères, viii. 306. Northern, 356.
Truce of God, iv. 56. Proclaimed at Rheims, 133.
Turan Shah, Sultan of Egypt, captor of St. Louis, vi. 26. Murdered, 28.
Turks, masters of Jerusalem—persecute pilgrims, iv. 23. Victories of, viii. 13, 14. Take Constantinople, 119.
Tuscany, Marquisate of, iii. 155. Invaded by Henry IV., 490. Disputed succession to, iv. 116, 434, 441.
Tusculum, Counts of, their power in Papal elections, iii. 223, 224. Enmity with Rome, iv. 428. Dismantled by Alexander III., and refortified, 432.
Twelfth century, epochs in, iv. 64. Review of—its great men, 65, 66.
Twoenge, Robert, resists Roman claims, v. 318. Carries remonstrances to Rome, 433.
"Type" of Emperor Constantine, ii. 276. Condemned by Pope Martin I., 277.
Tyrol, Æneas Sylvius in, viii. 84.

U, V.

Vacancies, vii. 516.
Valentinian, Emperor, i. 107. Confirms appeals to Roman Church, 136.
Valentinian III. supports Leo the Great, i. 275. Flies to Rome from Attila, 301. Murdered, 303.
Valla, Laurentius, viii. 123.
Valois, house of, its power, vi. 413, 511. Fall of, vii. 21.
Vandals conquer Africa, i. 263. Sack Rome, 306.
Van Eycks, the, viii. 435.
Vatican built, vi. 133. Library, viii. 123, 127.
Venetians, undertake conveyance of Crusaders, v. 83. Their terms, 89. At Zara, 96. Excommunicated, 100. Disregard excommunication, 100. Divide churches of Constantinople with Franks, 109. Appoint the Patriarch, 110. Their address to Pope, 113.
Venice, truce of, iv. 434. Rise of, v. 87. Advantages secured by, 127. Was not an archiepiscopal seat, 128. Her commerce—imports—works of art, 130.

VERCELLI.

- Under Interdict, vi. 518. Receives Greek Emperor and Patriarch, viii. 26. Doge of, his advice to Greek Emperor, 26. Jealous of the Church, 171. St. Mark's at, 421.
- Vercelli*, Council of, iii. 265. Cathedral of, viii. 444.
- Vernacular* languages and poetry, v. 235, 236. Literature, antisacerdotal, viii. 335.
- Vespasian*, tablet of, vii. 161.
- Vespers*, Sicilian, vi. 155.
- Vezelay*, church and monastery of, iv. 368.
- Ugo Falcodi*. See Clement IV.
- Ugolino*, Cardinal. See Gregory IX.
- Vicenza*, John of, a friar preacher, v. 443. His sermon near Verona, 445. His political conduct, 445, 446.
- Victor*, St., Hugo de, mysticism of, viii. 240.
- Victor*, St., Richard de, viii. 241.
- Victor*, Pope, i. 64. Favors Praxeas, 70.
- Victor II.* (Gebhard of Eichstadt), his influence with Henry III., iii. 275. Reluctant acceptance of Papacy, 285. Holds council at Florence, 287. Attempt on his life, 287. Present at death of Henry III.—made guardian to his son, 288. His power, 289. His death, 290.
- Victor III.*, Pope (Desiderius), his election, iii. 501. His reluctance, 503. Flies from Rome, 503. Resumes Pontificate, 505. Holds council at Benevento, 507. Anathematizes Guilbert, 507. Death of, 508.
- Victor IV.*, Antipope, iv. 289. His death, 296.
- Vienne*, Council of, excommunicates Henry V., iv. 112. Council of, vi. 504. Abolishes Order of Templars, 506. Declares innocence of Boniface VIII., 507. Acts of, 508.
- Vigilius*, his compact with Theodora, i. 462. Pope—embraces Eutychianism, 465. At Constantinople—hated by Romans, 466. His absence fortunate, 466. His vacillation, 467, 468. His sufferings, 469. Submission to Justinian, and death, 470.
- Villehardouin*, concludes treaty with Venetians, v. 89.
- Vined*, Peter de, Chancellor of Emperor Frederick II., v. 499. His disgrace and death, 500.
- Virgin Mary*, worship of, i. 204. Its origin, 205. Importance of, ii. 53. Defined, viii. 187. Head of saints, 205. Extravagant worship of, 207. Immaculate conception of, 208.
- Visconti*, Matteo, vii. 71. Excommunicated, 74. His death, 75.
- Visconti*, Galeazzo, captures Papal gen-

URBAN.

- eral, vii. 78. Excommunicated, 79. His quarrel with Louis of Bavaria, 96. His death, 108.
- Visconti*, Gian Galeazzo, vii. 269. His power and ambition, 278. His death, 279.
- Visconti* in Milan, vi. 515; vii. 211. Intermarry with France and England, 211. Ineffectual crusade against, 212. Their power, 221.
- Visigoth* law, i. 518, 537. Against heresy, 518.
- Visigoth* kings supreme over Church, i. 521.
- Vitalianus*, revolt of, i. 342. Supported by Pope Hormisdas, 342. Murdered by Justinian, 431.
- Vitalianus*, Pope, ii. 281. His reception of Emperor Constans—his dispute with Ravenna, 282.
- Vitelleschi*, John, vii. 564.
- Viterbo*, subdued by Innocent III., iv. 476. Hostility of Rome to, v. 404. Expels Imperialists, 462. Papal residence, vi. 80, 81.
- Virian*, Papal legate, iv. 389, 396.
- Ulpilas*, parentage of—Bishop of the Goths—his embassy to Valens, i. 872, 873. Becomes head of a Christian community—translates the Scriptures, 875, 876.
- Ultramontane* cardinals, vii. 239.
- Unity* of Church under Justinian, i. 450.
- Universities*, rise of, vi. 64. English, vii. 355.
- University* of Paris. See Paris.
- Urban II.* (Otto), Bishop of Ostia, is nearly elected Pope, iii. 508. Elected at Terracina, 510. Comes to Rome, and retires, 511. His poverty, 517. Holds Council at Piacenza, 518. Visits France, 520. Acknowledged by English Church, 523. Excommunicates Philip I., 524. His interview with Peter the Hermit, iv. 28. Holds Council of Clermont, 28. His speech, 29.
- Urban III.*, Pope, Archbishop of Milan, iv. 440. Refuses to crown Prince Henry, 441. Strife with Emperor Frederick, 443. Story of his death, 443.
- Urban IV.*, election of, vi. 80. Early history, 80. Appoints French Cardinals, 82. His situation, 82. Offers crown of Naples to St. Louis, 84. To Charles of Anjou, 85. Supports Henry III. against barons, 86. His league with Charles of Anjou, 90. His death, 91.
- Urban V.*, his reforms, vii. 209. Excommunicates Bernabo Visconti, 212. Petrarch's appeal to, 215. His voyage to Rome, 216. His amity with Emperor, 217. His return to Avignon, and death, 218.
- Urban VI.*, his election, vii. 233. His

URSICINUS.

character, 236. Condemns luxury of Cardinals, 237. His imperiousness, 238. Cardinals declare against, 240. His imprudent acts, 241. Creates twenty-six Cardinals, 243. His acts, 247. Successes, 249. Hostility to Queen Joanna, 251. At Naples, 253. Persecutes opponents, 254. Quarrels with Charles III. of Naples, 255. Arrests Cardinals at Nocera, 257. His cruelties to Cardinals, 258. Escapes to Genoa, 259. Proclaims Jubilee, 262. His death, and alleged madness, 263.
Ursicinus, rival of Damasus, i. 109, 111.
Utraquists, vii. 546.
Vulgate, its merits and influence, i. 117. Completed by Jerome at Bethlehem, 119. Discredit of, viii. 492.

W.

Wagons, Hussite, vii. 548.
Wala, grandson of Charles Martel, ii. 516. Becomes a monk, 516. Favors rebellion of Bernhard—disgraced by Louis the Pious, 524. Recalled to court—his influence over Louis, 527. His mission to Rome, 528. Joins in rebellion of Louis's sons, 534, 539. His death, 547.
Waldenses revere Arnold of Brescia, iv. 289. At Rome, v. 151. Their translation of Scriptures, 154. Their teachers, 225.
Waldo, Peter, v. 150-154.
Waltrada, concubine of Lothair II., iii. 46. Made Queen, 46. Excommunicated by Nicolas I., 55. Restored to communion by Hadrian II., 68.
Wallace, William, vi. 277.
Walter of Brienne, iv. 490. Commands forces of Innocent III.—defeats Germans before Capua, 491. His death, 493.
Walter of Troja, Papal chancellor, defeats Markwald, iv. 490. Jealous of Walter of Brienne—intrigues with Markwald, 492.
War, results of on clergy, vi. 249.
Wat Tyler, vii. 885.
Wearmouth, monastery of, founded, ii. 211.
Wenceslaus, Emperor, vii. 239.
Wenzel, Prince and Saint of Bohemia, iii. 127.
Wenzel (Wenceslaus), King of Bohemia, vii. 437. Favors Huss, 438. His death, 544.
Werner, favorite of Henry IV., iii. 334, 337.
Wessex, conversion of, ii. 92.
Western Church, its emancipation caused by Mohammedanism, ii. 370. And by other causes, 371, 372.

WYCLIFFE.

Western churches, viii. 421, 422.
Western Empire. See *Empire*.
Western Monasticism contrasted with Eastern, ii. 15. Its character, 16. Early, in Italy, 20. In Gaul, 20. In Spain, 21. In Britain, 21. Extreme notions of on celibacy, 31.
Westminster, Parliament at, iv. 334.
Whirby, Synod at, ii. 196.
Widekind, Saxon chief, ii. 478.
Wilfrid, his early history, ii. 200. Travels to Lyons, 201. To Rome, 202. Returns to Northumbria, 203. Consecrated Bishop, 204. Adventure with Sussex pirates, 204. Bishop of York, 205. Builds churches at York, Ripon, 209; and Hexham, 210; His reverses, 212. Superseded—appeals to Pope, 214. Thrown on coast of Friesland—at Rome, 214, 215. In Sussex, 216. Found a monastery of Selsey, 217. Converts Ceadwalla, 218. Restored to York, 219. His expulsion, 220. Second journey to Rome, 221. His death, 222.
Wilhelmina, her gospel, vii. 35. Her heresy overlooked, 35.
William I. of England, supported by Pope, iii. 392. Refuses fealty, 393. Makes Lanfranc Primate—deposes Saxon prelates, iv. 301. His respect for Lanfranc, 302.
William Rufus, his cupidity restrained by Lanfranc, iv. 302. Makes Anselm Archbishop, 303.
William of Holland, anti-Emperor, v. 494. His death, vi. 49.
William, Bishop of Utrecht, iii. 431, 432. Excommunicates Gregory VII., 439. His sudden death, 440.
William, King of Sicily, his alliance with Hadrian IV., iv. 275.
William of Pavia, Legate of Alexander III., iv. 374.
William, St., Archbishop of York, iv. 247.
William of Castries. Albigensian, v. 225.
Willis, Professor, viii. 445.
Winchelsea, Robert of, Primate, resists Edward I., vi. 261. His estates seized, 262; but restored, 263.
Witchcraft, laws against, i. 542. Ascribed to evil spirits, viii. 202.
Witiges, King of Goths in Italy, i. 456.
Woden compared with Mercury by the Romans, i. 358.
Wood, religious sculpture in, viii. 471.
World's end, expectation of (A.D. 1000), iii. 190.
Worms, Synod of, iii. 431. Concordat of, iv. 144.
Writings, antipapal, vii. 89-95.
Wulstan of Worcester, iv. 301.
Wurzburg, treaty of, iv. 142. Diet of, 363.
Wycliffe, his birth, vii. 855. At Oxford,

WYCLIFFITE.

856. His early writings, 859. Attacks Mendicants, 860. His preferments, 862. Professorship, 866. Embassy to Bruges, 867. Summoned to St. Paul's, 877. Papal proceedings against, 880. His replies to articles, 882. His translation of Scripture, 884. Endangered by insurrection of peasants, 888. His tenets condemned, 890. His petition, 892. His defence at Oxford, 894. His doctrines condemned — retires to Lutterworth, 894. His death, 899. His works, 400; and doctrines, 401. His books burned at Prague, 441. Represents University, viii. 878. His Bible, 885.
Wycliffite teachers, vii. 883. Martyrs, 412, 415, 416
Wykeham, William of, vii. 866. Impeached, 875. Restitution of, 876.
Wyschehrad, battle of, vii. 545.

X.

Xenaias (or *Philozenus*), disturbs Syria, i. 836.

Y.

York, see of, founded, ii. 188. Church at, 209

ZURICH.

Z.

Zabarella, Cardinal, at Constance, vii. 450, 475. Draws form of recantation for Huss, 492.
Zacharias, Pope, ii. 402. His interview with Liutprand, 404. Obtains peace, 405. His second interview — saves the remains of Empire in Italy, 406. Sanctions election of Pepin, 412. Claims grounded on this act, 413. His death, 416.
Zara, siege and capture of, v. 96. Crusaders winter at, 97. Venetian Archbishop of, 128. Rejected by Pope, 129
Zengis Khan ravages Eastern Europe, v. 455.
Zeno, Emperor, expelled by Basiliscus, i. 821. Reinstated, 822. Issues the Henoticon, 823.
Zephyrinus, Pope, i. 75.
Ziani, Doge of Venice, v. 128.
Ziska, victories of, vii. 545, 546.
Zosimus, Pope, i. 179. Declares Pelagius and Celestius orthodox, 180. Retracts, 184. Death of, 195. His conduct in case of Apollinaris, 265. Rebuked by African Church, 267.
Zurich, Arnold of Brescia at, iv. 239.

Widdleton's Editions of Choice Standard Works

REVISED EDITION

OF

Trench on the Study of Words.

LECTURES ADDRESSED (ORIGINAL-
LY) TO THE PUPILS OF THE DIOCESAN
TRAINING-SCHOOL, WINCHESTER. By RICHARD
CHENEVIX TRENCH, D. D. The Thirtieth American from
the last English Edition, enlarged and revised by the Au-
thor. 12mo, cloth, 248 pp., \$ 1.25.

"Language is the armory of the human mind, and at once contains the trophies of its past, and the weapons of its future conquests."

"This is one of the most instructive, as well as interesting books, and we particularly recommend it to those who are under the impression that the study of mere words must necessarily be uninteresting. Professor Trench has made what has heretofore been considered a dry and repulsive study interesting to all intelligent persons, even though they may be ignorant of any but the English tongue."

For sale at the principal Bookstores throughout the country
and mailed by Publisher on receipt of price.

W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,

New York.

Wilson's Noctes Ambrosianæ.

THE NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ. By Professor WILSON, J. G. LOCKHART, JAMES HOGG, and Dr. MAGINN. A revised edition, with Memoirs of the authors, and copiously annotated by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D.C.L., a steel portrait of Wilson and a fac-simile page of the Noctes; also steel portraits of Lockhart, Hogg, and Maginn. 5 vols. crown 8vo, cloth, cut or uncut edges.

"Briefly, the 'Noctes Ambrosianæ' constitute the most unique and piquant collection of original literature, in the English, and indeed, in any language. Their very power and wonderful variety, making them inimitable, will probably constitute a sufficient reason why no future attempt should be made in a like department.

"The pages of 'Blackwood' which, for nearly forty years have glowed with the brightest gems of British literature, can boast no prouder name than Wilson; although it has been the medium of the most brilliant productions of Jeffrey, McCulloch, Lockhart, Hogg, Maginn, Charles Lamb, Galt, Allan Cunningham, De Quincey, Coleridge, Mrs. Hemans, Samuel Warren, Jerrold, Walter Savage Landor, Monckton Milnes, and a long catalogue of authors whose works are lustrous with genius.

"And here we have the immortal 'remains' of the dear old man, in five handsome volumes, edited by a loving disciple (Dr. R. Shelton Mackenzie), and published in a style worthy of the work." — *New-York Evening Post*.

CHRISTOPHER NORTH. A Memoir of Prof. WILSON, from Family Papers and Other Sources. By his Daughter, Mrs. GORDON. Uniform with the "Noctes Ambrosianæ." With eight illustrations in wood, and a new steel portrait (the last one) of Wilson at the age of 60. 1 vol. crown 8vo, cloth, cut or uncut edges, \$2.25; half calf or half Turkey morocco, \$4.

Uniform sets of "Noctes" and "North," 6 vols. in bon, cloth, \$10.50; half calf, \$21.



For sale at principal Bookstores, and mailed by Publishers on receipt of price.

W. I. WIDDLETON PUBLISHER,
New York.

